2.1

# STUDIES IN
# VEDIC AND INDO-IRANIAN RELIGION AND LITERATURE

## VOL. II.

**Dr. Kshetresh Chandra Chattopadhyaya**

*Edited by*

**Dr. Vidya Niwas Misra**

*Director, K.M. Institute of Hindi studies*
*and Linguistics, Agra University,*
*Agra*

DISTRIBUTOR :
BHARATIYA
BOOK CORPORATION
1-U.B, Jawahar Nagar,
Bunglow Road, DELHI-7

BHARATIYA VIDYA PRAKASHAN
VARANASI DELHI
(INDIA)

*Publishers* :
BHARATIYA VIDYA PRAKASHAN
Post Box 108, Kachauri Gali, VARANASI-221001
1, U.B. Jawahar Nagar, Bungalow Road, DELHI-110007.

© MAHESH CHANDRA CHATTOPADHYAYA
BHAVESH CHANDRA CHATTOPADHYAYA
UMESH CHANDRA CHATTOPADHYAYA

*First Edition*, 1978

Price : Rs. 55/-

*Printers* :
Amar Printing Press (Sham Printing Agency),
8/25, Vijay Nagar (Double Storey),
DELHI-9 (INDIA)

# FOREWORD

The Second Volume of Pandit Kshetresh Chandra Chattopadhyaya's collection of papers relating to Vedic and Iranian Studies has two sections : One on Vedic chronology and some other problems and the other on Indo-Iranian Studies. Pandit Chattopadhyaya's greatest contribution to the Vedic Indo-Iranian Studies lies in his new method of interpretation. He is the first and the foremost scholar who takes into account not only the philological aspect of the Vedic and the Iranian text but also its ritualistic aspect and more than that the aspect of the continuity of the tradition either in the scholastic ritual or even in the folk ritual. For him search of truth and that of total truth was the highest human value and for this reason he improved upon his theories and continued to revise some of his hypothesis whenever he found that new facts or new observations called for such a revision. With a view to project his complete image, I have tried to arrange his papers as far as possible chronologically on the similar topic and also I did not mind at times repetition of some ideas in two successive papers. If I had tried to abridge his arguments, it would have taken out the logical structure of the revised paper.

His second important contribution lies in his ability to strike a balance between the traditionalists and the modern historicists. He had a deep reverence for both, but he had greater reverence for Truth and modest though he was, he never failed to assail a weak point in a theory propounded by howsoever a great scholar with vigour. He could accept a plausible interpretation even from the humblest disciples, but he always lived upto the principle of verifying facts for himself and coming to a judgment by himself. Whenever he was in doubt, he confessed it and even though he would then attempt to give two or three alternative explanations, he would in every such case accept his defeat in solving the problem to his own satisfaction. Such an intellectual integrity is almost rare. When I think of him, I am reminded of a brilliant remark by a Romanian artist Brancusi about India, "What I appreciate in India is its overwhelming vitality. In India I found peace and joy even in arduous pursuit for knowledge, I found dignity without pride and modesty without servility." Dr. Chattopadhyaya was an epitome of these qualities which combine to make India.

One may not agree with some of his ideas and interpretations (even I differ from him on some issues) and he himself did not want that one should agree with him, just because *he* said so. He rather incited people around him to dis agree with him and if they could convince him, he would then revise his opinion, but nobody can question his thoroughness and his own belief to come in the way of his historical thinking. He was an orthodox Hindu and observed his code meticulously, but as a Seeker of Truth, he was more openminded than even the most unbiased Indologist of the West. His interpretation of the Vṛṣākapi hymn and the Apālā hymn laying down a foundation for the uninhibited love-devotion of the Gopis for *Śrīkṛṣṇa* shows not only his insight but also his capacity to absorb even unpalatable facts of truth.

One of the reasons as to why he did not publish his studies in book form is that he was never satisfied with what he had done in the field of knowledge and he was always thinking in terms of improvement upon what he had written. His critics ascribe this diffidence to his indolence, but those who were close to him know fully well that he was adding notes after notes to supplement and revise his earlier papers. For example he started with a hypothesis that the date of Ṛgveda could be somewhere near 2500 B.C., but his later acquaintance with Mycenean inscriptions in Greek dating about 2000 B.C., incited him to further probing and he started a reassessment of the astronomical data in the Vedic literature. He could not come to a satisfactory conclusion, but he was definite on one point after this reassessment that the date of the Ṛgveda has to be pushed further back. Similarly, he prompted the theory that the name *Sarasvatī* (earlier Sarasvān) moved with the Aryans eastwards and so did several names like Kāśi and Kīkaṭa and he continued to elaborate it with new arguments and facts and he had a plan in his mind to work out the pattern of the Aryan movement in course of so many centuries, but at the same time he was firm in his conviction that the people who conceived even the earliest hymns of Ṛgveda were a mixed race, they were neither Nordic nor Dravidian nor Austric, they belonged to a period which had succeeded a long process of blending of racial traits. He refuted the theory of Schism between Indo-Aryans and Indo-Iranians, because he could see the parallel evolution of ideas in different as well as sister cultures at different places depending upon the physical and socio-cultural situation of the people concerned. He was one of these rare Indian Indologists who were not a slave of the West and yet who had the courage and honesty to accept the indebtedness of India to the cultures from which it borrowed new ideas and at the same time who could see that certain ideas are common to all the ancient cultures and it would be more meaningful to look into the parallel growth of such ideas than to see traces of borrowing in one from the other.

I sincerely believe that publication of his works would only reflect his personality as a scholar but would also inspire scholars young and old alike to pursue Indological studies with the premium value on the wholeness of Truth.

I bow down to his sacred memory in deep gratitude.

VIDYA NIWAS MISRA

Ananta Chaturdaśī
2035 Vikrama era

# CONTENTS

## Volume II

*Page*

### *Section III*—VEDIC CHRONOLOGY AND SOME OTHER PROBLEMS

1. Winternitz and Raychaudhary on the Antiquity of the Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā 3
2. The Place of the Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā in the Chronology of Vedic Literature 16
3. A Survey of Studies in the Vedas and Indo-Aryan Origins 25
4. Reference to Writing in the Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā 63
5. Kīkaṭa in Ṛksaṁhita : Its Identification and Archaeological Importance 71

### *Section IV*—INDO-IRANIAN STUDIES

1. Vedic Studies : New Directions in the Light of Indo-Iranian Material 83
2. The Legend of Yima and the Cradle of the Aryans 93
3. Martin Haug's Theory of Indo-Iranian Religious Schism 101
4. The Traditional Date of Zarathushtra : Is West's Correction Necessary ? 127
5. The Date of Zarathushtra 132
6. The Religious Reform of Zarathushtra 158
7. Can we Accept the Traditional Data of Zarathushtra 167
8. Progressive Importance of Mithra Worship in Zoroastrianism 180

# SECTION III

## VEDIC CHRONOLOGY AND SOME OTHER PROBLEMS

## II. 7

# WINTERNITZ AND RAYCHAUDHARY ON THE ANTIQUITY OF THE ṚGVEDA-SAṀHITĀ[1]

वेदा निःश्वसितं यस्य सर्वज्ञानमयश्च यः ।
तं नत्वा परमं देवं वादमेकं प्रवर्तये ॥
ऋग्वेदसंहिता श्रौती स्मृतिर्बौधायनादिकी ।
अन्तरमेतयोर्मध्ये जालिकं विद्यते महत् ॥
इति वैन्तर्निसं पक्षम् असाधुं चौधुरी जगौ ।
प्रागीयस्तत्त्ववेत्ताऽत्र प्रयागस्थस्य मे मतम् ॥

The date of the Vedas has been for a long time a vexed problem. Several attempts have been made at different times to determine it on objective grounds but they have convinced only the writers themselves. The result is great uncertainty for uncritical acquiescence in this view or that. It is, therefore, necessary that we should from time to time critically examine the views propounded by scholars about the date of the Vedas.

Professor M. Winternitz of Prague delivered in the University of Calcutta in August, 1923, his first Readership Lecture on 'The Age of the Veda', which was published in

---

[1] Abbreviations used in the paper :—
Ṛv. S.—*Ṛgveda Saṁhitā.*
A.B.—*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.*
S.B.—*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.*
V.I.—*Vedic Index* by Macdonell and Keith.
Some Problems—*Some Problems of Indian Literature* by Winternitz.
Sarasvatī—'*On the identification of the Rgvedic river Sarasvatī and some connected problems*' by the writer (Journal of the Department of letters, Calcutta University., Vol. XV).
C.R.—*Calcutta Review*
J.R.A.S.—*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

C.R., November, 1923, and was reprinted in 1925, along with the other lectures delivered by him, under the title *Some Problems of Indian Literature.*

Dr. Hemchandra Raychaudhuri published in C.R., October, 1824, pp. 67-77, a criticism of Prof. Winternitz's views. Winternitz did not reply to Raychaudhuri's criticism when revising the English translation of his *Geschichte der indischen Literatur Bd.* I (Calcutta, 1927) and I do not know if he has replied anywhere else. The questions raised by Raychaudhuri are very important and they deserve proper examination. I propose to confine myself here to only the geographical aspect of the problems raised by him.[2]

Winternitz has shown that Max Müller's dates for the different classes of Vedic Literature, which are only minimum dates, but are wrongly taken by other scholars as exact dates, are purely arbitrary.[3]

In view of the vastness of the Vedic literature and the great development in thought and form that it shows, he finds it impossible to take that literature as ranging between only six centuries (1200 B.C. to 600 B.C.). He thinks that Aryan penetration into Hindustan and then into South India must have been a very slow process. We know that Aryan culture had penetrated into South India already in the third century B.C. and important Vedic schools like those of Baudhāyana and Āpastamba had been established there. The beginnings of Vedic literature and civilization have therefore to be placed long anterior to this time. He says in this connexion : *And yet*

---

[2] I cannot examine here Dr. Raychaudhuri's historical arguments for determining the date of the Vedas. I may only say this that he has placed too much reliance on the *vaṁśa* in the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Āraṇyakas*, which are both confused and contradictory. His further assumption that two successive teachers named in a *vaṁśa* list are removed from each other by one generation is wholly unjustifiable. We have here only *vidyā sampradāya* and not succession lists of Pontiffs; in one generation a certain *vidyā* can pass through many mouths. Consequently positing of an interval of 30 years or any other fixed interval between these successive teachers is absolutely unwarranted.

[3] *Some Problems*, p. 5.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

*during the whole time from the first beginnings to the last off-shoots of Vedic literature the Indo-Aryan people have only conquered the comparatively small area from the Indus to the Ganges.* If it took such a long time for Aryan civilization to spread only from the extreme North-West to the Eastern Ganges District, how many centuries must have been required not only for Vedic literature but at the same time also for Brahmanical culture, theology and even priestly supremacy to pervade the whole of Central and Southern India.[5]

Raychaudhuri seriously doubts the correctness of the sentence italicized. He says :

(1) The *Brāhmaṇas* show the expansion of the Aryans into Central India and the Deccan, e.g.—

(a) A.B. knows of *Vidarbha* (VIII, 34) and 'several kingdoms of *dakshiṇā diś*' (VIII, 14) [6]

(b) Ś.B. refers to the *Niṣadha* country (II, 3.2.1, 2) and to *Vidarbha* (XIV, 5.5. 22 and 7.3.28=*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* in the Kāṇva recension II, 6.3 and IV, 6.3).

(2) Even Ṛv. S., admittedly the earliest Vedic text, also shows traces of knowledge of Eastern and Central India :—

(a) It refers to the *Sarayū* (IV, 30, 18, etc.).

(b) As it contains the compositions of Gotama Rāhūgaṇa (I, 74-93), the leader of the Āryan colonization of Videha, and names Namī Sāpya, the king of Videha (VI, 20. 6; X, 48. 9) it cannot be removed from the time of the eastward expansion of the Āryans.

(c) It directly names *Kīkaṭa*, i.e. Magadha III, 53. 14).

(d) The *Cedī* country is also referred to (VIII, 5. 37-39).

'It is thus clear', says he, 'that not only the Ganges valley, but a considerable portion of Central India and the

---

[5] *Some Problems*, p. 15.

[6] I have supplied references where they are wanting in Raychaudhuri's paper and corrected them where they are wrong.

Deccan was Āryanized long before "the last off-shoots of Vedic literature".[7]

The italicized sentence of Winternitz, criticized by Raychaudhuri, is not very happily worded, for it seems to suggest that even the latest Vedic texts show that the Āryans confined to the Punjab and western U.P., but the next sentence shows that he wants to include the whole of U.P. and Bihar.[8] But Raychaudhuri's contention that they include Central India and Deccan as well requires examination. The Vidarbha country, as such, is not referred to in the *Aitareya* and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas* : we have Bhīma Vaidarbha named in the former text and a Vidarbhin Kauṇḍinya in the latter. It will, of course, be natural to take *Vidarbha* and *Vidarbhin* as formed from the place-(*cum*-tribe-) name *Vidarbha*. But what is there to show that *Vidarbha* as a place name meant in that age our modern Berar? These *janapada-vācaka* terms originally meant certain tribes and were used by extension for places where they were settled at that time. Hence the use of the plural number for such names. When a tribe shifted from one locality to another, the name (meaning both the tribe and the locality) was also shifted.[9] It is thus that we have so many transferences of geographical names in India and outside. We have, therefore, to determine the exact significance of these geographical terms occurring in the Vedas independently of their Purāṇic connotation. If we were to be guided by the Purāṇas and the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* (!) in these matters,[10] the whole Vedic literature would have to be explained in their light and all the characteristic Vedic myths and legends would then put on a different appearance altogether. This would be an absolutely unhistorical method which no historian should ask us to follow. Vedic texts themselves and not the Purāṇas should be chiefly used for interpreting the Vedas. It is thus that we know that the Gomatī mentioned in Ṛv. S., X, 75. 6, is the Gomal in Afghanistan and not the Gomati in U.P. Failure to recognize this simple point has led to many mistakes in the interpretation of Vedic history and geography. We should not, therefore, assume that Vidarbha and Cedi in the Vedas meant Berar and Bundelkhand respectively. Unfortunately, there is nothing in these texts to show where the Vidarbha people and the Cedis were dwelling in the times of A.B., Ś.B. and Ṛv. S. VIII, 5.[11]

---

[7] C.R., Oct., 1924, p. 69.

[8] For he speaks there of the 'Eastern Ganges District'. In his *History of Indian Literature* (Vol. I, p. 303) his wording is 'from the Indus as far as the Ganges, the actual Hindustan.'

[9] See the writer's Hindi paper, 'Vaidik Bhūgol', in the *Bhūgol*, IX, p. 51 and also his *Sarasvatī*, pp. 5-6 and 43-48.

[10] As Raychaudhuri wants us to in connexion with the identification of *Kīkaṭa*.

I fear that the alleged reference to the Niṣadha country in Ś.B., II, 3. 2. 1, 2, cannot be accepted. First of all, Naḍa Naiṣidha (and not Naiṣadha)[12] is mentioned there. The name *Naiṣidha* is formed from *Niṣidha* and not *Niṣadha*. It may be contended that *Niṣidha* is only the earlier form for the later name *Niṣadha*, which is by no means impossible. But we are as much ignorant about the location of the Niṣadha country in that age as of Vidarbha and Cedi. And can be sure that Naḍa Naiṣidha was a king as is assumed in V.I.[13] from which we might gather that he was the king of the Naiṣidha= Niṣadha country ? The text of Ś.B. does not seem to bear this out. It runs as follows :—

एता ह वै देवता योऽस्ति । तस्मिन् वसन्तीन्द्रो यमो राजा नडो नैषिधोऽनश्नन्त्सांगमनोऽसन्यांसवः ॥१॥ तद्वाऽएष एवेन्द्रः । यदाहवनीयोऽथैष एव गार्हपत्यो यमो राजाथैष एव नडो नैषिधो यदन्वाहार्यपचनस्तद्यदेतमहरहर्दक्षिणत आहरन्ति तस्मादाहुरहर्वै नडो नैषिधो यमं राजानं दक्षिणत उपनयतीति ॥२॥

---

[11] I say this in spite of V. I. I, p. 268, under Cedi.

[12] Eggeling in SBE., XII, p. 338, suggests and the *Vedic Index*, I, p. 433, asserts that Naiṣidha is wrongly printed for Naiṣadha. This is to be rejected. *Naiṣidha* is the actual reading of the 1955, of S.B. followed not only by Weber but also by Satyavrata Sāmaśramin in his Calcutta edition and corroborated by Sāyaṇa's commentary.

[13] Following Weber (*Indische Studien*, I, 225-7), who has accepted Sāyaṇa's identification of Naḍa Naiṣidha without famous Nala, King of Niṣadha of *Mahābhārata* fame.

'These are indeed gods, who dwell in (the house of) the Yajamāna, viz. Indra, King Yama, Naḍa Naiṣidha, Anaśnant Sāṅgamana and Aśant Pāṁsava. Now, the Āhavanīya fire is Indra, the Gārhapatya fire is King Yama and the Dakṣiṇa fire is Naḍa Naiṣidha that every day they carry fire to the south for him (i.e. for Dakṣini-Naḍa Naiṣidha),[14] it is for this that people say "Every day Naḍa Naiṣidha leads King Yama to the South".'

Here Naḍa Naiṣadha is most expressly called a god like Indra and Yama. The meaning of the last sentence, referring to his leading Yama to the south every day, is not clear.[15] In any case, his actual mention as a god and his identification with the Southern. god takes him to the domain of mythology. Consequently we learn nothing about the whereabouts of the Naiṣidha tribe. It is possible to equate Naḍa Naiṣidha with Nala Naiśadha, but that would make Nala mythological in origin (—The Reed Fire, famous in myths of the origin of fire ?) and not Naḍa of human birth. H. Jacobi has shown a similar mythological origin for the famous Rāma story. The romantic story of Urvaśī and Purūravas is in origin also a nature myth. Even if Naḍa Naiṣadha is taken as an old hero, already raised to the status of a god in Ś.B., we learn nothing about the location of his Niṣidhas. If they were a 'southern' people, even that would not carry us far, for 'south' is a relative term, and we must know 'south of what place ?'.

Ṛv. S. shows the Aryans still confined to the west of the Ganges. The Sarayū is certainly mentioned there. But there is nothing to show that it is the famous river in Oudh. The Sarayū is referred to in Ṛv. S., IV, 30. 18; V, 53. 9 and X, 64. 9. In V, 53. 9, it is named along with Rasā, Kubhā, Krumu and Sindhu, all western rivers. It is, therefore, very likely, that Sarayū too is a western river, identical with the old Iranian Harōyu (=modern Harīrūd).[16] This is confirmed by the fact that in the whole Ṛv. S. the Ganges is named only once,[17] viz. in the late *nadīstuti* of the *Tenth Maṇḍala* (X, 75. 7). It is highly improbable, therefore, that the Sarayū of Oudh should have been known to the poets of Ṛv.S. Raychaudhuri's statement that 'In the time of the Ṛg Veda Aryan settlements had spread as far as......the Sarayu the association of which with the Ārya Citraratha (Ṛg Veda, IV, 30,18; Rāmāyaṇa, II, 32. 17) suggests that the river which flows past Ayodhyā is meant'[18] cannot be accepted, because the *Rāmāyaṇa* does not prove any such thing. Ṛv. S. IV, 30. 18 mentions that Indra killed the two Āryas Arṇa and Citraratha on the banks of the Sarayū. What has that Citraratha to do with the Citraratha mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, II, 32. 17 ? The thirty second canto of the Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* describes Rāma's gifts to Brahmins and his friends when he was about to leave Ayodhyā for the forest. Citraratha who was Rāma's charioteer and old companion (सचिव:[19] सुचिरोषित:) was one of these recipients. He can never be identified with Citraratha of Ṛv. S., IV. 30. 18. It is true that in the *Rāmāyaṇa* also this Citraratha is called *ārya* (II, 32. 17). But *ārya* here means 'noble', 'respected'. The charioteer was always a very trusted and honoured officer of the princes in ancient India. Rāma calls the charioteer Sumantra *prabhu* ('master') in *Rāmāyaṇa*, II, 46. 25. We cannot, therefore, identify this 'noble' Citraratha with the Citraratha killed by Indra. That the two Citrarathas are both called *ārya* proves nothing. The word means 'noble' in the *Rāmāyaṇa* but not so in the *Ṛksaṁhitā* passage. There the sense seems to be that of 'man', as in Ṛv. S. I, 59. 2; I, 117. 2 and other passages. Citraratha is an *ārya*, i.e. 'human' antagonist

---

[14] Fire burns continuously in the Gārhapatya pit and it is carried from there to the Āhavanīya and Dakṣiṇa pits at the time of the daily oblations in those fires. The Dakṣiṇa fire is in the Southern direction.

[15] Winternitz takes it to mean that he undertook 'warlike expedition towards the south' (*History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 388). But this is on the assumption that Naḍa Naiṣidha was a human hero.

---

16. *Sarasvatī*. d. 48, n. 3, and *Vaidik Bhūgol*, p. 47. Similarly Gomatī referred to in VIII, 24. 30 and X, 75-6 the Gomal (*vide Sarasvatī*, pp. 43-5 and *Vaidik* Bhūgol, pp. 45-6).
17. It is by no means certain that उरु: कक्षो न गाङ्ग्य: of VI, 45. 31, refers to Gaṅgā. See *Vaidik Bhūgol*, p. 45.
18. C.R., Oct., 1924, p. 74.
19. 'Minister' is not the only sense of Saciva in Sanskrit.

of Indra in IV. 30. 18, as contrasted with his *dāsa*, i.e. 'demon',[20] enemies, Śuṣṇa, Kaulitara, Śambara and Varcin, named in verses 13-15. The evidence of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, therefore, does not place the Ārya Citraratha on the Sarayū of Ṛv. S., IV, 30. 18, in Oudha.

I have already said that 'south' is a relative term. Consequently the 'southern kingdoms' mentioned in A.B., VIII, 14, should not be assumed to be kingdoms in the Deccan. We are fortunate to find in this case an indication in the text as to where those southern kingdoms are to be placed. A B., VIII, 12-14, describes the Aindra Mahābhiṣeka. Section 14 contains that wellknown passage in which the gods are described as consecrating Indra in different directions, from which different kinds of overlordship accrued to him. In connexion with the southern direction it says :—

अथैनं दक्षिणस्यां दिशि रुद्रा देवाः पड्भिश्चैव पञ्चविंशैरहोभिरभ्यषिञ्चन्नेतेन च तृचेनैतेन च यजुषैताभिश्च व्याहृतिभिर्भौज्याय तस्मादेतस्यां दक्षिणस्यां दिशि ये के च सत्वतां राजानो भौज्यायैव तेऽभिषिच्यन्ते भोजेत्येनानभिषिक्तानाचक्षत एतामेव देवानां विहितिमनु ।

'Then the Rudra gods consecrated him in the southern direction with six days with the Pañcaviṁśa *stoma*,[61] with this group of three *ṛcas*, with this *Yajus*, with these *Vyāhṛtis*, for *bhojaship*. Therefore in the southern direction whatever kings of the Satvants are consecrated, people call them 'Bhoja' after this ordainment of the gods.'

After a few sentences we are told that 'in the fixed, central direction' (ध्रुवायां मध्यमायां प्रतिष्ठायां दिशि) the Sādhya and Āptya gods consecrated him for *rājya*, after which in that direction, among the Kuru-Pañcālas and the Vaśa-Uśīnaras, the consecrated kings are called *Rājan*. Consequently the central country is where the Kuru-Pañcālas and the Vaśa-Uśīnaras dwelt. Besides this specification there are several

---

20. I have shown in a paper, 'Dāsa and Dasyu in the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhita*'. communicated to the XVII International Congress of Orientalists, held at Rome in September 1935, that *dāsa* and *dasyu* meant in the Ṛv. S. 'demon' and not 'non-Aryan' as is commonly assumed.

21. See Keith *Brāhmaṇas of the Ṛgveda*, p. 330n.

other indications to show that A.B. is a product of the Kurukṣetra country. 'In the southern direction' must therefore mean to the south of the lands of the Kuru-Pañcālas and the Vaśa-Uśīnaras, where lived, as we have just seen, the Satvants, i.e. the Yādavas. Consequently the land meant is obviously the Mathurā region and adjoining districts.[22] From there to the Deccan is a far cry.[23] We have also no justification for taking the Āndhras mentioned in A.B., VII, 18, as inhabitants of the Deccan. All that the text warrants is the fact that they were frontier people (उपान्त्या:) with reference to the Aryan settlement.[24]

*Kikaṭa* of Ṛv. S., III, 53. 14, can never mean Magadha as has been almost universally assumed.[25] It is true that the *Śrīmad Bhāgavata* (I. 3. 24),[26] and other mediaeval texts know *Kīkaṭa* as a synonym for *Magadha*. But that does not warrant us to assume that they were synonyms in the time of Ṛv. S, III, 53. A close study of that hymn shows that it refers to Sudās's crossing of the Beas and the Sutlej and his subsequent adventures under the guidance of his priest Viśvāmitra as in III, 33.[27] Ṛv. S., III, 33. 11, 12, say that the Bharatas who were about to cross the rivers wanted to acquire the cattle on the other side and III, 53. 14, obviously refers to the same thing.[28] We find the Tṛtsu-Bharatas earlier in Central Punjab. Consequently they crossed the Beas and the Sutlej from the north-west. Viśvāmitra requests Indra in III. 53. 14, to give over to his people the cattle of King Pramagandha of the Naicāśākha city or territory in the country of Kīkaṭa, because the people there did not worship Indra with the milk of those cows. The context forces on us the conclusion that Kīkaṭa is the country to the immediate south of the Sutlej, i.e. the land that was later known as Kurukṣetra. That the people there did not perform the Vedic sacrifice shows that they were non-Aryans unaffected by Vedic civilization. Yāska is therefore quite right when he says : कीकटो नाम देशोऽनार्यनिवासः, 'Kīkaṭa is the country where non-Aryans dwell', *Nirukta* VI, 32. Jarl Charpentier has offered a very interesting explanation of *Naicāśākha*, viz. 'a place where the banyan tree (lit. "with branches hanging downwards"—Yāska नीचाशाख(=नीचैः शाख.) was worshipped.'[29] We need not accept the whole of his explanation, for the simpler sense of 'abounding in banyan trees' would easily come out of the etymology. It is interesting to note that A.B., VII, 30, actually makes Kurukṣetra the home of the banyan tree :

---

[22] See location of the Satvants in the map in V.I. Vol. I.

[23] A.B., VIII 15, however, knows the earth extending to the sea. We do not know if this is the eastern sea or the western one. The seventh and eighth *pancikās* of the A.B. are very late additions, later than the *Śāṁkhāyana Brāhmaṇa*. Ṛv. S. also shows some knowledge of the sea (See V-I., Vol. II. pp. 431-3).

[24] Similarly, we should not suppose that the historical Āndhra-Sātavāhanas originated in the Telugu country merely because the Telugu country is now known as Āndhra, though the historical indications are quite different. The further assumption that the Śātavāhanas were Dravidian is also as unhistorical. The name Āndhra may be connected with *Andhaka*, borne by an Aryan Yādava tribe.

[25] See *Vaidik Bhugol*, p. 52, J.R.A.S.; 1930, pp; 896-7.

[26] ततः कलौ संप्रवृत्ते सम्मोहाय सुरद्विषाम् ।
बुद्धो नाम्ना जिनसुत; कीकटेषु भविष्यति ॥
—कीकटेषु मगधविषयेषु Vijayadhvaja's com., कीकटेषु मध्ये गयाप्रदेशे Śrīdhara and Viśvanātha Cakravartin.

[27] See Sarasvatī, p. 61, J.R.A.S., 1930, p. 896.

> न्युब्जा इति हाप्येनान् एतर्ह्याचक्षते कुरुक्षेत्रे ते ह प्रथमजा न्यग्रोधानां तेभ्यो हान्येऽधिजाताः ।

'they (the banyan trees) are called now *nyubja* (i.e. "bent" —*naicāśākha*) in Kurukṣetra; these (i.e. the banyans of Kurukṣetra) are the first born of all banyans, others are born from them'. It appears from this passage that the Aryans met with the banyan tree in Kurukṣetra first. Hence *Naicāśākha* would be a very appropriate name for Kurukṣetra. Consequently it is this Kurukṣetra which should be taken as the non-Aryan Kīkaṭa country of Ṛv. S., III, 53. 14. We are now informed that remains of a pre-historic civilization as at Harappa, Mohenjodaro, etc. have been found in this region also.[30] We may hope that excavation in this area will reveal vestige of the impact of the Aryans and the pre-Aryans. As the frontier of the expanding Aryans advanced, 'the land of the non-Aryans' receded, till it reached Magadha, which was for long a non-Aryan's land.[31] Hence the later use of the term Kīkaṭa for Magadha. The Ṛgvedic Kīkaṭa is only Kurukṣetra.

---

[28] See Sarasvatī, pp. 51-2, 61-2. Ṛv. S., III, 33. I, names Vipās was encountered. First when moving to the south-east from Central Punjab.

[29] J.R A.S , 1930, pp. 335-345. See also my note in, ibid., pp. 894-7.

Raychaudhuri's contention that Gotama Rāhūgaṇa of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* fame, the leader of the eastern colonization, is known to Ṛv. S. also, does not deserve acceptance. The *Anukramaṇī* of Ṛv. S. ascribes hymns 74-93 of the First Maṇḍala to Gautama Rāhūgaṇa but there is nothing in those hymns to show that their authors had anything to do with Gautama Rāhūgaṇa, priest of Videgha Māthava, of Ś.B. The plural राहू॑गणाः (i.e. Rāhūgaṇas) in I, 78. 5, by the side of गोत॑मेभिः or गोत॑मासः ('by Gotamas' 'Gotamas') in I, 77. 5, 78. I, 88. 4 and 92. 7, shows that Rāhūgaṇa is as much of a family epithet as Gotama. We cannot, therefore, take Gotama Rāhū gaṇa as the name of a single individual. That the Gotama Rāhūgaṇa of Ś.B. is not among the authors of Ṛv. S., I, 74-93, is proved by the fact that of the three verses Gotama Rāhūgaṇa recites in Ś.B. not a single one comes from the Gotama Rāhūgaṇa collection of Ṛv. S.[32] As regards Nami

---

[30] At Kotla Nihang in Dt. Ambala, 30 to 40 miles to the north-west of the present Kurukṣetra. See *India* in 1920-30, p. 354 and also the forthcoming *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India for* 1229-30.

[31] Cf. the Smṛti injunction against journey to Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga Saurāṣṭra and Magadha :

अङ्गवङ्गकलिङ्गेषु सौराष्ट्रमगधेषु च ।
तीर्थयात्रां विना गच्छन् पुनः संस्कारमर्हति ॥

Johan Van Manen finds the ultimate source of such injunctions in *Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra I, I.2. 18-15* (*Advance proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, April-May, 335, pp. 25-6).

[32] वीतिहोत्र त्वा कवे etc. comes from Ṛv. S., 26. 3; उदग्ने शुचयस्तव etc. from VIII, 44. 17; and तं च घृतं स्रवीमहे etc. from V. 26. 2.

Sāpya, who is mentioned in Ṛv. S, I, 53. 7, VI, 20. 6 and X. 48. 9, as a friend of Indra who was killed by demon Namuci (Prolonged drought ?) on his account, he may be a king of the Videhas as the *Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa* XXV, 10. 17) makes him out to be. But how can we conclude from this that he lived in North Behar ? We should note that Māthava is called a Videgha (=Videha) in Ś.B. even when he was living on the banks of the Sarasvatī (I, 4.3. 10 and 14) and had not left for the east following the track of Agni Vaiśvānara and his priest Gotama Rāhūgaṇa. That is exactly because Videha is a tribal epithet. Namī Sāpya, king of the Videhas (वैदेहो राजा), also is placed by the *Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa* on the banks of the Sarasvatī, where he performs a Sārasvata *sattra* that takes him immediately to heaven. We learn from this text that in the course of the *sattra* Namī Sāpya marched from *Vinaśana* (the place where the Sarasvatī disappears in the sands) up the stream to Plakṣa Prasravaṇa, which is forty days' ride, and there took his final bath and that his sacrificial cattle pastured to the north, on the banks of the lake *Sthūlārma*. Consequently the old habitat of the Videha tribe must have been in the vicinity of the Sarasvatī basin, i.e. in or near the Kurukṣetra country.

Consequently Raychaudhuri is wrong in claiming that Ṛv. S. contains traces or the diffusion of the Aryans up to Behar and Central India or that the *Brāhmaṇa* texts show their penetration into Southern India. His mistake is due to his following the unhistorical method of Pargiter which seeks to interpret the *Vedas* in the light of the *Purāṇas* which are in age and spirit very far removed from the *Vedas*.

Therefore the thesis of Winternitz, that the Vedic texts show that the Aryans took a very long time in penetrating into the whole of Hindustan and extending further south, remains unaffected. He has, however, joined in one mistake which is unfortunately very common, that the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā* is in its entirety earlier than the rest of the Vedic literature.[33] A close study of the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā* shows that though much or most of it is earlier than the other Vedic texts, there is still a good deal in it that belongs to their time and there are even some portions that belong to the age of the very latest works comprised in the Vedic literature.[34] There must, therefore, be compositions in Ṛv. S. which are contemporaneous with or later than the expansion of the Aryans into Behar or into Central or Southern India, but, as chance would have it, no certain geographical references indicating this have been preserved in the extant text of Ṛv. S. The greater portion of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā*, however, remains sharply distinguished from the other Vedic texts and must be considered on grounds of language, thought and sundry other matters as earlier than those works.

---

[33] Some problems, pp. 9, 19. In my earlier writings I too assumed the correctness of this view. I have, however, corrected myself in a paper entitled, *The place of the Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā in the chronology of Vedic literature*, read before the Eighth All India Oriental Conference, held at Mysore in December, 1935.

---

[34] E.g. the *Āprī*, *Pra-Uga*, *Aśvamedha* and other ritual hymns and hymns like X, 190, which are very late.

## II. 8

# THE PLACE OF THE ṚGVEDA-SAṀHITĀ IN THE CHRONOLOGY OF VEDIC LITERATURE

प्रणम्य परमात्मानं वेदानुभवगोचरम् ।
ऋग्वेदसंहिताकालविवेकं कञ्चिदारभे ॥

It is commonly believed by western and Indian scholars that the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* is older than the other Vedic texts. This view is correct to a certain extent, for the earliest portions of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* must be earlier than the remaining Vedic literature. But when it is assumed that this *Saṁhitā* is in its entirety earlier than the *Yajurveda* and *Sāmaveda Saṁhitās*,[1] we are not supported by facts. But still this baseless assumption has been made and it has become so general that to challenge it will appear to many as the height of boldness. It is however, our duty to take stock from time to time of the positively ascertained facts and to examine the bases of our assumptions.

The chief ground for taking the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* as the earliest Vedic text is the archaic character of its language as compared with much of the remaining Vedic literature. Another ground for this conclusion is the fact that a large number of verses which are in their proper contexts in the *Hymns of the Ṛgveda* are found utilised in the *mantra* collections of the other Vedas, from which one may infer that they were borrowed from the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā*. Both these grounds make the comparative antiquity of *large portions* of the *Ṛigveda-Saṁhitā* almost certain. But they do not entitle us to assume that the whole of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* is older than the other Vedic texts. Is the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* a homogeneous text, whose different portions must be assigned to practically the same age? Scholars have always recognised that this *Saṁhitā* has older and later portions.[2] Consequently there remains an *a priori* possibility that the later portions of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* come down to very late times.

---

[1] Macdonell, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 40 and 171; Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature* (English Translation). Vol. I, p. 57; *Some Problems of Indian Literature*, p. 9, etc.

It is not true that Maṇḍalas I (or large portions of it), VIII and particularly X of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* are the only later additions. There are enough indications to show that additions were made even in "the family books," the original nucleus of the *Saṁhitā*. If we make a careful study of the arrangement of these "family books," among which we should include Maṇḍala I which is a collection of "family groups" too small for forming entire Maṇḍalas, the following scheme seems to have been followed by the original redactors:—

1. the family groups were "arranged according to the decreasing number of the hymns in each of these books" ;
2. within each family group, the Agni hymns came first, then the Indra hymns and then the Viśvedeva hymns (if there were any) and after them hymns to the other deities in due order ; and
3. within each *devatā* sub-group, the hymns were "arranged according to the diminishing number of stanzas contained in them."

It will also appear to the observer that at several places these principles have been violated. As the exceptions are fewer than the agreements, they prove the rule. Consequently we can safely infer that wherever the general scheme has been disturbed we have reasonable grounds for suspecting interpolations. Thus, even the "family books" have been added to. And they have been added to *from time to time*. To give an instance, the original Indra collection of the III Maṇḍala was hymns 30-50, the first hymn (30) containing 22 verses, and the last (50) only 5 ; the three supplementary Indra hymns (51-53), having respectively 12, 8 and 24 verses, seem to have

---

2. Macdonell, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp 41 ff. *Vedic Reader for Students*, Introduction, pp. xiv-xvi.

been added in two instalments, hymn 53 (24 verses) having been added some time after hymns 51 (12 verses) and 52 (8 verses) had been appended to the original Indra collection. There are many more such later additions, in some cases of entire groups of hymns Now these later additions are not necessarily all later compositions. They may have been added later, because they were discovered later. But some of them certainly can be compositions of later times.

Then there are six verses in the accepted text of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā*, I. 99.1, VII. 59.12, X. 121.10 and X. 190. 1-3, whose *Pada-Pāṭha* is wanting.[3] The only inference that we can make from this fact is that these verses did not form part of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* when Śākalya compiled its *Pada-Pāṭha*. Consequently they have been added even so late as after the time of Śākalya. In this case too it is not possible to say that they were all *composed* after Śākalya, particularly when VII. 59.12 and X. 121.10 are found in the various *Yajurveda-Saṁhitās*. But we can presume this for X. 190. 1-3, which bear on their very face the impression of lateness. We do not find these three cosmogonic verses, showing knowledge of the *Kalpa* theory, till the very late *Taittirīya Āraṇayaka* (X. 1.13), a text which shows knowledge of Smṛtis (I. 2.I). They may, therefore, well be the composition of a very late period. If the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* thus contains verses which were likely composed after the time of Śākalya, we cannot deny the possibility of some of the verses or hymns recognised by him being also creations of times not far removed from his.

I have said above that the chief ground for placing the greater portion of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* in a very early period is the archaic character of its language. But the *Saṁhitā* is not lacking in late linguistic features as well. It is well known that the word *ásura* means 'a good spirit', 'a god' or 'God' in the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* as its cognate *ahura* means in the Avesta, and that in the later Vedic literature and in classical Sanskrit the word has undergone semantic deterioration, acquiring the sense of 'demon'. But of the 108 times that the word occurs in the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā*, in as many as 15 cases, *viz.*, in II. 30.4, V. 40.5, V. 40.9, VI. 22 4, VII. 99.5. VIII. 06.9, VIII. 97.1, X. 53.4, X. 82.5, X. 131.4, X. 138.3, X. 157.4 and X. 170.2, it bears the later sense. Consequently the hymns in which these passages occur should be assigned *linguistically* to the period of the later Vedic literature. Other passages that similarly show late linguistic characteristics must also be considered as of late date. But the converse of this proposition is not necessarily true. It is possible that even in later ages unbroken family traditions enabled the priestly bards to compose hymns in antique form. In fact, there are several indications to show that this actually happened. Consequently there must be some hymns in the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* which, though early in form, are yet actually late in date.

---

[3] X. 20. 1, whose *Pada-Pāṭha* is similarly lacking, is not an entire verse but the opening of X. 25.1, added at the beginning of the Vimada collection like the Pazand prayers before Avestan texts or the *Śāntipāṭhas* before Upaniṣads.

Then the fact that the *mantra* collections of the other Vedas contain verses found in their proper contexts in the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā* does not necessarily prove that those Vedas are later than the formation of the *Ṛksaṁhitā.* The manner in which the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* was originally formed and added to from time to time shows that its constituent hymns long remained current in different priestly families before they were incorporated in the *Saṁhitā*. It is not without significance that the so-called "Ṛgvedic verses" in the other Vedas often show different readings, making it likely that they were taken from some "floating materials". There are many parallels in India and outside of unrecorded folk-songs and other "floating material" having been utilised in rites and ceremonies over wide areas.[4]

Consequently closer study reveals several circumstances that throw some doubt on the arguments that have been adduced in favour of the relative antiquity of the whole of the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā*. The different attempts that have been made so far for the detailed chronological stratification of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* by Arnold, Belvalkar, Weist and others have either failed or met with only partial success, for failing, among other reasons, to recognise that poems antique in form may yet be late in date. I therefore apply the criterion of *thought* for determining the early and the late passages in this text. My own study has been chiefly from the point of view of the history of Vedic rituals. Applying this test to the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* we can recognise a large number of hymns in it as belonging to the period of *Yajurveda* and the *Sāmaveda.*

---

[4] See Ralston, *The Songs of the Russian People*; Ram Naresh Tripathi, *Kavitākaumudī (Grām Gita) Maynā natir Gān*, etc.

Let us therefore see what are the broad facts about the history of Vedic rituals. It is generally assumed that the use of the sacred fire for the sacrifice to the gods comes down from the Indo-Iranian times. But Herodotus' definite statement to the contrary about the sacrifice of the Ancient Persians (I. 132) makes this impossible. This is what he says on the subject :

"And this is their fashion of sacrifice to the aforesaid gods : when about to sacrifice they neither build altars nor kindle fires, they use no libations, nor music, nor fillets, nor barley meal ; but to whomsoever of the gods a man will sacrifice, he leads the beast to an open space and then calls on the god.........He then cuts the victim limb from limb into portions, and having roasted the flesh spreads the softest grass, trefoil by choice, and places all of it on this. When he has so disposed it, a Magian comes near and chants over it the song of the birth of the gods, as the Persian tradition relates it ; for no sacrifice can be offered without a Magian. Then after a little while the sacrificer carries away the flesh and uses it as he pleases" (Loeb Translation.)

Herodotus' account of the Persian religion has been rightly taken as well suited to the *Urarisch* religion.[5] It seems thus that the use of fire for the pouring of oblations *to other gods* was not known to the Aryans before their bifurcation into Indians and Iranians. In the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* itself there are traces which show that the oldest form of the Vedic sacrifice was of the same simple character as the Perian sacrifice decribed by Herodotus. The gods are frequently invited to come to the *barhis* and take the Soma or other food there, *e.g.*, in VI. 68. 11 cd इ॒दं वा॒मन्धः॒ परि॑षिक्तम॒स्मे आ॒सद्या॒स्मिन् ब॒र्हिषि॑ मादयेथाम् "Sitting on this strew exhilarate over this beverage poured for you two in our sacrifice." Consequently Fire could not have been used, as a *havyavāhana* in the earliest period of the Vedic sacrifice. This use must have been a late development, of the nature of the *pratipatti karman.*[6] The transition probably lay in the lighting of the fire before commencing sacrifices, to chase away the demons. Agni thus became an invoker (होता॑ from ह्वे) of the gods first, and their priest (होता॑ from हु) afterwards.

---

[5] *Cf.* Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 393, n. 1.

Herodotus speaks of the use of prayers at the Persian sacrifice. The *Ṛksaṁhitā* shows that invocation of the gods was the most important element in the earlier Vedic ritual, *e.g.*, in III. 33 (where Viśvāmitra *prays* to the rivers, Vipāś and Śutudrī, to allow a safe crossing to the Bharatas) and VII. 18 (mentioning Vasiṣṭha's prayer to Indra to give victory to Sudās against the ten kings). These prayers must have been originally spontaneous effusions. In course of time, however, the priestly bards began imitating each other,[7] and formulaic expression came into vogue. Later still, the composition of new hymns on the occasion of sacrifices went out of vogue and only older hymns were used.

Besides invocations, the gods must have received certain offerings. Following the dictum यदन्न: पुरुषो लोके तदन्नस्तस्य देवता: we may safely infer that in the earliest pastoral stage the Vedic Aryans must have chiefly offered animal food to their gods. With the increase of agriculture the use of cereals for

[6] Defined as उपयुक्तस्य आकीर्णकरस्य द्रव्यस्य विहितदेशे प्रक्षेप: । (*Mīmāṁsā paribhāshā*, ed. Jha, p. 18). The student of the rites of later Hinduism will recall the case of the throwing of the *piṇḍa* into the Ganges or some other holy place after dedication to the ancestors. In fact the Mīmāṁsakas distinctly say that the throwing into the fire of the oblation in the main sacrifice is a *pratipatti karman* (*Ibid*).

[7] See Bloomfield, *Ṛg-Veda Repetitions*.

food and for offering to the gods must have come more and more in use. As regards the *drink* offered to the gods, it must have been Soma even in the earliest stage of Vedic worship of which we have any trace. Personally I have grave doubts about Soma being Indo-Iranian. I suppose that it was used by the ancestors of only the Vedic Aryans and by the Hauma-drinking Scythians (*Sakā Haumavaryā*) of the Ancient Persian inscriptions. The comparative rarity of the Soma plant in India probably forced the early Indo-Aryans to use its juice only in the worship of the gods and not in ordinary human fare, and later to use a substitute, the *pūtikā*, for the ritual also. That the pressing and offering of the Soma must have been a very complex affair in the beginning does not seem likely on *a priori* grounds, nor is it suggested by the language of the earlier hymns of the *Ṛksaṁhitā*. The three pressings and the other details of the Soma sacrifice, described in the Yajurveda, appear to be late developments. Similarly elaborate fore-offerings in a fixed order (*Prayājas*) before animal and cake-offerings must also be later developments. In fact, all *prayājas* and *anuyājas* seem to belong to late times. There are several sacrifices mentioned in the other Vedas which were invented most certainly in a late age. Among them is the famous *Aśvamedha*, whose late character is conclusively proved by the fact that it is treated in the Yajurveda texts in portions that are obviously later additions.[8] The *Atirātra* Soma sacrifice must be another late ritual, and so also the *Pravargya* ceremony.[9]

---

[8] In the *Maitrāyaṇīya Saṁhitā* Aśvamedha is treated in the closing portion (Prapāṭhakas 12-16) of the Third Kāṇḍa, which is known as *Upari-Kāṇḍa, i.e.,* additional Kāṇḍa (the Fourth being a still later supplementary Kāṇḍa). In *Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā* Aśvamedha is treated in a special *Aśvamedha Kāṇḍa*, called *aśvamedho-nāma pañcamo granthaḥ*, unconnected in arrangement with the *Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā* proper in 40 chapters. The supplementary character of tha Aśvamedha sections is most manifest in the Taittirīya texts. There the sacrifice is not treated in one place but its *Mantras* and *Brāhmaṇas* are scattered about the text: *Taittirīya Saṁhitā* IV. 4.12; 6,6-9; 7.15; V. 1,11; 2-11, 12 (*Brāhmaṇa*); 3.12; (*b*); 3,12 (*b*); 5.11-24; 6.11-23, 7.11-26; VII. 1.11-20; 2.11-20; 3.11-20; 4. 12-22; 5.11-25; *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa*); *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* III. 8, 9 (*b*). Even the later Śukla Yajurveda shows

Now, (1) when the present *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* contains three hymns, I. 162-164, connected with the *Aśvamedha*, I. 164 further showing affinities with the *Upanishads* (see, *e.g.*, verses 20 and 46) ; (2) when it contains as many as 10 Āprī Hymns, *i.e.*, verses in due order for the *Yājyā* of the 11 (in some cases 12) *Prayājas* in the animal sacrifice, I. 13, I. 142, I. 188, II. 3, III. 4, V. 5, VII. 2, IX. 5, X. 70 and X. 110 ; (3) when it includes other verses in due order for the later elaborate ritual like the *Praügaśastra* in I. 2-3 and II. 41 ; (4) when it makes actual reference at several places to late rituals like the *Atirātra* or the *Pravargya* (VII. 103, 7, 9) or to sacrificial technicalities like the *sūktavāka*, *subrahmaṇya*, *yājyā*, *vaṣaṭ*, *juhā upabhṛt*, *sruva*, *idhma*, *yūpa*, *chaṣāla-trikadruka*, *paridhi*, *prastara*, *puroḍāśa karambha*, etc., etc., (I. 32.3 ; 76.5 ; 116.24 ; 120.4 ; 121.6 ; 162.2 ; II. 11.17 ; 15.1 : 22.1 ; 34.11 ; III. 8.6—10 ; 18.3 ; 27.5 ; 28.1—6 ; 41.3 ; 52.1—8 ; IV. 2.9 ; 5.6 ; 6.3 ; 12.1 ; 24.5 ; 33.16 ; V. 1.3 ; 14.3 ; 21.2 ; VI. 23.7 ; 63.4 ; 67.10 ; VII. 1.6 ; 43.2 ; 84.1 ; 99.7 ; 100.7 ; VIII. 2.11 ; 13.18 ; 23.20, 22 ; 31.2 ; 43.10 ; 44.5 ; 2.4; 6.12 ; 6074.6 ; 79.1 ; IX. 114.4 ; X. 2.2 ; 4.4 ; 5.4, 5 ; 14.16 ; 17.13 ; 21.3 ; 45.9 ; 62.4 ; 88.7, 8 ; 91.11 ; 15 ; 96.9 ; 114.3—5, 8 ; 115.2, 9 ; 118.2, 3 ; 179.1), it is impossible not to believe that much of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* belongs to the period of the later Vedic texts. We should note that many of the hymns containing such late matter, like the Āprī hymns, noted above are in proper order in the text of the

---

that there too the *Aśvamedha* section is a late addition. It is well known that in the *Mādhyandina Saṁhitā*, chapters 1-18 from the original nucleus and the following 22 chapters are later additions in several instalments (Weber, *History of Indian Literature*, pp. 107ff.). The Aśvamedha sacrifice is treated in chapters 22-24 and again in a further supplement, ch. 29 (also in 39.8-13).

[9] This rite is treated in only the late *Āraṇyaka* (Book IV in the Taittirīya School and among the Mādhyandinas in chapters 37-39 of their *Saṁhitā*, which are among the very latest additions to this text (Weber, *op. cit*, pp. 107-8).

"family groups" and therefore must have formed part of the first collection of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā*.

The texts of the Yajurveda, it is well known, contain *mantras* required in the ritual, in their order of application. As the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* also contains a number of such *mantras* (*e.g.*, the *Āprī Sūtras*), we cannot remove much of its materials from the epoch of the Yajurveda. As it further contains *mantras* in connection with the *Aśvamedha* ceremony, which we cannot assign to the earlier stratum of the Yajurveda, portion of the *Ṛksaṁhitā* must be accepted as belonging to even late Yajurvedic times. For all these reasons, it is necessary that we should give up the assumption that the whole of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* is preYajurvedic. The remark also applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Sāmaveda, for the *Ṛksaṁhitā* contains a few references to *sāmans* also. Neither is Ātharvanic matter wholly lacking in our text. Consequently we should take the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* in its present form as containing materials from the earliest to (almost) the latest periods of Vedic literature. The *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* is thus not a *book* but a *library*. Consequently when we find any particular matter in this text we should not immediately assume that it belongs to a very early phase of Indo-Aryan culture. We have to determine carefully the relative ages of the different hymns, and, in some cases, also of different verses. The task is difficult. But it is ou- duty to attempt it in a truly scientific manner.

## III

# A SURVEY OF STUDIES IN THE VEDAS AND INDO-ARYAN ORIGINS

I propose to give a critical survey of studies in the field prior to 1937 particularly those published in India.

The first work to which a grateful reference is due is the second and concluding part of Volume II of Viśvabandhu Śāstrī's *Vaidikapadānukramakośa* published last year, completing a verbal index of the Brāhmaṇas and the Āraṇyakas. We are now eagerly awaiting the publication of Volumes I, III and IV of this *Kośa*. This work, when completed, will be a great help to the study of the Vedas. The organisers of this great undertaking are badly in need of funds for a speedy completion of the work. May I utilise this opportunity of making an appeal to all lovers of Vedic studies to give to the Vishveshwaranand Vedic Research Institute and Society such help as they can for an early completion of this great concordance ?

The next work probably in order of importance is the Second Volume of the very excellent edition of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā* with Sāyaṇa's commentary brought out by the Vaidika Saṁshodhana Maṇḍala of Poona. The text of Sāyaṇa's commentary as printed here is immensely superior to the Bombay edition and has also improved on Max Müller's Second Edition. A reference is also needed to the sixth fasciculus of the very elaborate edition of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* of the Indian Research Institute of Calcutta, which came out in August 1936. The English translation has been now entrusted to a scholar (Dr. Manilal Patel) who really possesses the philological equipment needed for translating the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*. One

---

1. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS, A.I.O.C. Ninth Session, Trivandrum.

may, however, doubt the wisdom of beginning to publish an edition of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* in such elaborate style, when experience of other similar schemes shows that this elaborateness of treatment cannot be maintained for long. Already the profuse notes that the editor of the Sanskrit portion was adding in the beginning have disappeared by the sixth fasciculus. A few years ago Sāyaṇa's was the only commentary available on the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*. But other commentaries have been lately discovered and are in course of publication. Dr. Lakshman Sarup has undertaken an edition of the whole of Veṅkaṭamādhava's commentary with comparative notes from other commentaries. We are anxiously awaiting the speedy completion of this undertaking.

Not of much scientific value is the First Volume of the *Sāmaveda-saṁhitā* (containing the *chanda-ārcika*) with Sāyaṇa's commentary, translation and notes, published in the Calcutta Sanskrit Series (No. XVI, 1936). One wonders why the *Pada-pāṭha* is given at all, when the editor could not mark the accents. A comparison with the edition of the *Sāma-padapāṭha* printed by Satyavrata Sāmāśramin in his *Uṣā* shows the unsatisfactory character of the *padas* given in this edition, even leaving out of consideration the lack of accents. Some competent scholar should take in hand a carefully collated edition of the *Sāma-padapāṭha,* using the North Indian manuscripts which mark all the three accents but not neglecting the manuscripts of the South. The system of accentuation of Northern manuscripts is of considerable importance to the student of Sanskrit grammar. The chief Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda, the *Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa* has now been reprinted in the Kashi Sanskrit Series (No. 105) with a more satisfactory text of Sāyaṇa's commentary than in the Bibliotheca edition, particularly in the second volume brought out last year. It is, however, to be regretted that no special pains were taken over the first volume. The same series (No. 127) has reprinted in an excellent edition the first four Kāṇḍas of *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.* We look to a speedy publication of the remaining Kāṇḍas. Dr. Raghu Vira of Lahore has laid us under a deep debt of gratitude by taking up the publication of the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* in its entirety, of which the first volume is just published. We hope that the remaining portion will be published soon. One wonders why the editor has not chosen to give even a preliminary description of the manuscripts used in the volume published and their relationship. However learned and critical an editor may be, he should allow the readers to judge for themselves the correctness of the readings he has chosen. This they cannot do if a full description of the manuscripts does not accompany the text.

The *Paippalāda* text of the *Atharvaveda-saṁhitā* was so long available only in the photographic copy published by Bloomfield and Garbe in 1901. L. C. Barrett had given us editions of individual *kāṇḍaṣ* but with the exception of Books Sixteen and Seventeen published together as Volume IX of the American Oriental Series (New Haven, 1936), those editions were scattered over different numbers of the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Dr. Raghu Vira has recently brought out a sumptuous edition of the first thirteen *kāṇḍas* in book form (Lahore, 1936). The work has been very carefully done. One only regrets that no attempt was made to supply the lacunae at the beginning of the Tūbingen manuscript. I learn from a friend much interested in Vedic studies, who had been in Kashmir, that there are still Vaidikas of the Paippalāda school in that land and they actually begin their text with the verse शन्नो॑ दे॒वीर॒भिष्ट॑ये etc., as Roth guessed in 1875 (*Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir*, p. 16).

Further progress has been made in the publication of the *Bhāradavāja Śrauta Sūtra* (Praśna XII. 6 8) in Dr. Raghu Vira's *Journal of Vedic Studies* (Vol. II Nos. 2-3) and we have a careful edition of the *Śaiśirīya śikṣā* by Dr. Tarapada Chowdhury in the same journal (Vol. II No. 2). The Calcutta Sanskrit Series (No. XVII) has given us a good edition of the *Gobhila Gṛhya-Sūtra* with the commentary of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa (Vol. I, 1936), for lack of which Mahāmahopādhyāya Chandrakānta Tarkālaṅkāra wrote his well known commentary. Work has been continued on the edition of Kātyāyana's *Śrauta-sūtra* with the *paddhati* of Devayājñika in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series (fasciculi iii to x, 1936). The same series has brought out another fasciculus (ii) of the *Agniṣṭomapaddhati* by Vāmanācārya and others (1937). The same publishers brought out last year in the Kashi Sanskrit Series the *Śulbasūtra* of Kātyāyana with the commentaries of Karka and Mahīdhara. Mention must also be made of the new edition of the *Vedāṅgajyotiṣa* brought out last year by Dr. R. Shamasastry with his own commentary and an English translation. He has evidently added a good deal in his explanation that is not actually in the text.

Besides editions of texts and commentaries, some studies have been also published on different aspects of the Vedas. Of considerable interest is the newly started journal *The Mīmāṁsā Prakāśa*, of the Mīmāṁsā Granth Prakashak Samiti of Poona, which, it may be hoped, will help in the spread of knowledge of the Vedic rituals. The study of Mīmāṁsā and of the Vedic ritualistic texts, I need hardly add, greatly help each other. Mr. Hiralal Amritlal Shah has published in the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute* (Vol. XVII, pp. 97-176) in an enlarged form his paper on 'Vedic Gods' communicated to the Seventh Oriental Conference. Such sweeping astronomical interpretations are not likely to carry conviction to people. It is not right to come to important conclusions on the basis of just a few texts, omitting to take into account all the other texts of similar import and the bearings of their contexts. A theory should not satisfy only its author but should be so presented that it can carry conviction to others. We should not forget the needs of *parārthānumāna* in our speculations.

Strictly objective is Dr. A. B. Keith's paper 'New Theories as to Brahman' in the *Jhā Commemoration Volume* (Part II, pp. 199-215), just published (Poona 1937). Professor Keith has examined the views of Hertel, Charpentier and Dumezil about the original meaning of *brahman* and shown that we need not go beyond the sense of 'prayer'. He seems to suggest that, if at all, we may add the connotation of 'holiness'. It is a great pity that many of the speculators on the original meaning of this Vedic term have left certain evidence of the Vedic texts themselves for the doubtful light thrown by supposed cognates in other Indo-European languages. "अत्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत् ।" so asks the Sanskrit proverb. It is possible that *brahman* and *barhis-barzish* are derived from the same *root*, but that does not give to *brahman* the sense of *barhis*. There is nothing to show that *baresman* and *brahman* are to be connected. The text of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* makes it abundantly clear that the word meant only 'prayer'. There is no evidence about the magical potency of the mere *kuśa* grass in the Vedic ritual. The power belonged to the prayer which drew the god to the worshipper and made him grant the latter's desires.

Dumezil's attempt at interpreting *brahman* through Latin *flamen* ('priest') and Greek *pharmakos* ('scapegoat') and *phārmakon* ('drug') in the light of Frazer's theory of the connexion of the king or his priestly substitute with nature and his dying to revivify it is as unsuccessful as Hertel's earlier interpretation of *brahman* as a cosmic firelight substance through equation with Greek *phlegma* ('heat'). Frazer's theory itself is hardly correct and the attempt at interpreting a Vedic idea in its light is of doubtful wisdom. The connexion between Greek *pharmokos* and *pharmakon*, Keith points out, is itself not very clear. If, however, the latter word is equated with Sanskrit *bharman*, 'nourishment', 'preservation' (cf. *Raghuvaṁśa* III. 12

कुमारभृत्याकुशलैरनुष्ठिते भिषग्भिराप्तैरथ गर्भभर्मणि ।
पतिः प्रतीतः प्रसवोन्मुखीं प्रियां ददर्श काले दिवमभ्रितामिव ॥

we can take *pharmakos* as the corresponding agent noun. Neither *pharmakos* nor *pharmakon* gets connected with *brahman* It is, however, possible that Latin *flamen* **flammen*<*flaghmen* is connected with the secondary stem *brahman*, 'the praying priest', with the accent of the primary stem shifted to the final syllable. The action noun *brahman* must mean function of this priest and the sense of prayer or *mantra* suggested by the text of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* is quite adequate for our purpose. In looking for its etymology in India itself we find the use of the root *bṛh* (<*bhṛgh* ?) in the sense of 'extending' in quite a number of Vedic texts, e.g. in *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa* I. 3. 6. 10, प्रबर्हंस्तृणीयत्, 'the barhis should be spread on the vedi after *extending* it' and in the word *bṛhat*, 'extensive'. *Brahman* is thus 'magnification>'the extolling of the god'>'the prayer'. That the Vedic poets themselves realised that *brahman* "the prayer" etymologically meant 'magnification' is evident from passages like *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* 11. 12. 14, यस्य ब्रह्म वर्धं॑नम्, 'whose furtherer *brahman* is' or VIII. 1.3, अ॒स्माकं॒ ब्रह्मे॒दमि॑न्द्र भू॒तु॒ तेऽहा॒ विश्वा॑ च वर्धं॑नम्, 'O Indra, may our *brahman* be ever thy furtherer'. We may, however, safely connect with *brahman* Icelandic *bragr*, 'poetical art', and *Bragi*, the name of the presiding diety of poetry, eloquence and wisdom.

The passage from the sense of 'prayer' to that of the Highest Being in the Upaniṣads can be easily understood if we keep in mind the history of Vedic religious ideas. The Vedic bards believed that their prayers or mantras were effective and they did not scruple to place them by the side of the gods to whom they were addressed or even to make the prayers alone responsible for the attainment of their desires. In the Brāhmaṇas the sacrifice is similarly raised to the highest status and the gods themselves are again and again described as sacrificing. We should remember that prayer in the form of *śastra* is as much of a *pradhāna karman* in a sacrifice as the offering of oblation (*Jaimini* II. 1. 13-29). The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (IV. 16.1) says that 'speech' is one of the two paths of the sacrifice, the other being 'mind'. This and other texts of the Sāmaveda speak of the "singing in" of the fulfilment of desires (कामम् आगायानि etc.). We have a good parallel to this idea in the Finnish epic *Kalevala* in which Vainomoinen (in Runo II) and Lemminkainen (in Runo XXIX) bring into existence many new things by their songs. 'Prayers' or 'mantras', which are spoken words of great potency, thus come to occupy the place of a deity in the estimation of priests. Not only *brahman* or mantra in general but individual mantras like the *sāvitrī ṛc* or ejaculations like *om*, *ā* (*Kenopaniṣad* IV. 4) etc , or parts of the *stotra* like the *udgītha* (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, Chapters I and II) acquire the same character. When, however, in the age of the Upaniṣads, the philosophically minded people began to posit a First Principle, a Creator, these ritualists stepped forward and identified that Principle with their own *brahman*. It is thus 'power' and not 'magic', nor even 'holiness', which is the connecting link between the old sense of 'prayer' and the Upaniṣadic sense of 'Creator'. This power aspect of Brahman, the Highest Being, is quite evident in the *Kenopaniṣad*. We have also enough parallel of the deification and worship of mantras or sacred texts in Ancient Iran (cf. *Yash* I. 22, *ahunom vairīm yazamaide*, "we worship the Ahuna-Vairya formula". It is in this way that *brahman* came to mean the omnipotent and omnipresent Absolute of the Upaniṣads from the sense of 'prayer' or 'efficient mantra'.

Though Roth had recognised as early as 1961 that the words *dasyu* and *dāsa* in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* primarily meant 'demon' (*Sanskrit Worterbuch*, Vol. III. 557-8, 604-5), it has become usual of late to forget that and to understand the two words as meaning only the non-Aryan enemies of the Aryans whom they are supposed to have enslaved. Some time ago I had an occasion to study closely all the passages in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* where they occur and the conclusion that was forced on me was that the ethnic interpretation of these terms was unwarranted by the texts. I communicated a short note on this subject to the XIX International Congress of Orientalists which met at Rome in September, 1935 and a Hindi translation of the paper appeared in the *Hindustāna* (January, 1936, pp. 59-65). As the *Acts and Transactions of the XIX International Congress of Orientalists* in which the original paper has been printed have not yet been published and as the Hindi translation of my paper is not accessible to many, I take this opportunity of giving publicity to my findings. Well known demons like Śuṣṇa, Ahi, Namuci and Śambara (*sic*—not a non-Aryan chief) have been called *dasyu* or *dāsa*. The waters released by Indra have been described as formerly lorded over by *dāsa*. The gods bring light or happiness for *man* by destroying *dasyus* or *dāsas*. Indra has to use his thunderbolt against them and even to receive the aid of the Maruts and other allies to cope with them. All this clearly indicates that *dasyus* and *dāsas* are mythological beings, that they are demons. Indra overpowering the dark broods of the *dasyus* or *dāsas* with the light of the sun cannot be understood with reference to ethnics. The non-Aryan native would not certaily stand in dread of the sun. There are numerous parallels in Indian and foreign folklore of the conception of the demons as moving in darkness and being overpowered by the light or the sight of the Sun. What has led scholars to suppose that *dasyus* and *dāsas* were non-Aryans is that they are often called 'not worshipping' or 'not sacrificing' (*a-karman, a-brahman, a-vrata* etc.). It is believed that this is because the non-Aryan did not follow the sacrificial cult of the Aryan. But are not the gods themselves described in the Brāhmaṇas as sacrificing ? If the gods can perform sacrifices, surely their rivals, the demons, can be described as not performing them. We have parallels in Babylonian and other literatures also of demons being described as not performing rites.

The description of the *dasyus* as 'noseless' (*anāsaḥ*) is confined to only one passage, V. 29,10, [2]where the context tells us that like Vṛtra (verse 7), Ahi (v. 8), Śuṣṇa (v. 9) and Pipru (v. 11), these noseless "Dasyus" should be understood—by *sandaṁśa-nyāya*—as certain demons. The adjective 'noseless' is of a piece with other epithets indicating physical deformity used for demons, like 'handless', 'footless', 'shoulderless', (e.g. in I. 32.7). This has nothing to do with the so-called snub-nosed features of the Dravidian natives. As a matter of fact, Dravidians are *not* snub-nosed, the average nasal index of the present day Dravidians being less than 77, in no way differing

---

2. If *rājānaḥ* in *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* I. 32. 6, an epithet for Ahi, is to be analysed as *rujānas* and interpreted as a Bahuvrīhi compound, "with a shattered nose", we get a good parallel for *anāsaḥ* in V. 29, 10,

from the average in North India.[3] And then the features of the men or gods represented in statues and plaques in the proto-Indian civilization of the Indus basin show that the Aryans must have met with men settled in the Punjab and in Sind who could not be called snub-nosed by the widest stretch of language. Most of the skulls found in the Indus basin show either medium or narrow noses, the indexes varying between 43.75 and 50.8. Archaeological evidence is thus against the Aryans having had to deal with "noseless" natives. There are many parallels in Babylonian representations of demons and in modern Indian folk-lore of certain demons and goblins being conceived as 'noseless'.

The dark colour of the *dāsas* can be easily understood because the demons are the counterentities of the "shining" gods: That the "*dāsā* colour" is described as "placed below" is because the demons were conceived as having their home below the earth, as is proved by parallels in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* (e.g. V. 32.7) and later Indian literature, the Avesta (e.g. *Yasna* IX. 15) and Teutonic and other lores. The hymns of the Ṛgveda abundantly make it clear that their poets were as afraid of the *dasyus* and *dāsas* as were the writers of the Brāhmaṇas of the *asuras*. Certainly, the sturdy Aryan conquerors had no cause to be afraid of the vanquished non-Aryans. But for all their physical strength and military equipment, the Aryans could not escape the universal fear of demons. This demonophobia comes from that fear-complex which is innate in man and manifests itself in strange forms to-day, even among "civilized" people.

It is only in a small number of passages where *dasyu* or *dāsa* is used by the side of *ārya* that there is any difficulty in taking the terms as meaning 'demon'. But is it certain that *ārya* had an ethnic connotation? In quite a number of passages *ārya* or *āri* means 'pious man' and in I. 59·2 simply 'man'. In classical Sanskrit *ārya* ordinarily means 'a good man'. We should remember that 'good' was the meaning of the element *ari* in the Greek superlative *aristos*. It is believed that the word *ārya* bore an ethnic connotation in Indic and Iranic. But the matter requires fresh investigation. Darius probably means by *ariya* and *ariya-cithra* in Naksh-i-Rustam a 14, 'noble', 'of noble lineage', as opposed to the upstart Gaumāta, the Median, and not 'Aryan', 'of Aryan birth'.

---

[3] There are, of course, peoples in South India with a very broad nose, but we have as little justification for taking them to be "Dravidian" in stock simply because they speak Dravidian tongues at the present day as for taking peoples of Tibeto-Burman or other non-Aryan stock in North India who speak Aryan languages as being "Aryan" in race.

There is thus no adequate reason to suppose that *dasyu* or *dāsa* had an ethnic connotation anywhere. The terms correspond to *asura* of the- later Vedic texts. They seem to be derived from √das, 'to lay waste' of which several forms are found in the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā*. *Dāsa* is probably etymologically connected with the portion *dahāka* of the name of the Iranian arch-find Azhi Dahāka (=Ahi*Dāsaka) *Dāsá*, meanidg 'servant', may be, etymologically, a quite different word.

Reference may also be made to a paper in the *Indian Culture*, Vol. III, pp. 9-18, in which I have pleaded for a historical study of Vedic geography, as in two earlier papers on the subject.[4] I have shown how place names have been carried from one locality to another when a people has migrated from its old home to a different area. We should, therefore, use considerable circumspection in identifying the geographical names occurring in the Vedic texts. I may specially draw your attention to the finding that *Kīkaṭa* meant in *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* III. 53. 14 the Kurukṣetra country and not Magadha.[5] We may hope to find in this area objective evidence of the contact of the Aryans and the non-Aryans in course of the excavations that the Archaeological Department has recently taken in hand.

---

[4] 'On the Indentification of the Ṛgvedic river Sarasvatī and some connected problems' (*Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, Vol. XV) and 'Vaidic Bhūgol' in Hindi in *Bhūgol*, Vol. IX, pp. 37 ff.

[5] See also *JRAS*, 1930, pp. 894-7, 'Vaidik Bhūgol', p. 52 and the paper 'Kīkaṭa in *Ṛksaṁhitā*, in the present volume.

In connexion with the interpretation of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, the dates of the earliest commentaries recently made available have been engaging the attention of scholars. Dr. Lakshman Sarup has reiterated in the *Jhā Commemoration Volume* (Part II, pp. 399-410) his conviction that Skandasvāmin lived in the sixth century A.D. and not in the seventh century. His pupil Harisvāmin wrote his commentary on the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* according to a manuscript in the Government Sanskrit College, Benares, under a Vikramāditya reigning in Ujjayinī in 3740 Kali Era, *i.e.* 638 A.D. But Dr. Sarup emends the date as 3640 Kali Era (*i.e.* 538 A.D.) as he thinks that there could be no Vikramāditya, king of Ujjayinī, in the seventh century A.D. Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah has taken serious exceptian to this emendation and has also made light of the value of the date given in the Benares manuscript (*Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, Vol. X. pp. 201-230). His own view is that Skandasvāmin came later than Uvvaṭa (end of the eleventh century A.D.), from whom he has borrowed. To prove the latter contention Dr. Venkatasubbiah has compared the commentaries of Uvvaṭa and Skanda on 11 passages, taking them from the published portion of Skanda's commentary on the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*. We are very much indebted to him for draw-our attention to the close connexion between Uvvaṭa and Skanda. But I must confess that he has failed to convince us that it is Skanda who has borrowed and not Uvvaṭa. The originality of Uvvaṭa in his comments on *Vājasaneya-saṁhitā* 23.5=Ṛv. I. 6.1) to which he makes reference (p. 218) has no bearing on the question of priority. Similar originality is displayed by Skanda at several places. The impression that is left on my own mind is that Uvvaṭa has given in short much of what Skanda gave in full. The question of the relative chronology of Uvvaṭa and Skanda cannot be definitely decided, however, without an examination of their comments on all common verses.[6] Till that is done, the evidence of the Benares manuscript relied on by Dr. Lakshman Sarup must hold the field.

It may be permitted, however, to doubt the advisability of the emendation made by Dr. Sarup. He says that there could be no Vikramāditya in Ujjayinī at a time when Harṣavardhana was ruling over the whole of North India. But why? A Vikramāditya need not necessarily be an emperor. A petty local ruler of Ujjayinī might well have borne the title of Vikramāditya. What definite evidence is there to show that there was a Vikramāditya in Ujjayinī in the sixth century? Hoernle's theory that Yaśodharman bore that title is not supported by Yaśodharman's own inscriptions. Yuan Chwang speaks of a king of Ujjayinī in his time who "belongs to the Brahmin caste. He is well learned in heretical (*i.e.* Brāhmaṇical) books and believes not in the true law (*i.e.* Buddhism)" (Beal, *Records of the Western World*, Vol. II. p. 271—Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. II, p. 250). What is there to show that this unnamed king did not bear the epithet of Vikramāditya? The seventh century was the time of a militant revival of Vedicism, when lived and preached Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and, as has recently become probable, the great Śaṅkarācārya too. We may well expect in this century the existence of a patron of commentaries on the Vedas.[7] There is thus no more difficulty in placing Skandasvāmin in the beginning of the seventh century A.D. than in the sixth century.

---

[6] I am not convinced by the argument advanced by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja for establishing that Uvvaṭa wrote a commentary on the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* (*Proceedings of the fifth All-India Oriental Conference*, Vol. I, pp. 280-1). There is nothing to show that Deva-rāja was referring to the interpretation of a passage in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* (VII. 15-3) by *amātyam iti*. The passage meant by him may have been beginning one with *amātyam* which unfortunately we cannot spot now.

[7] Was the *samrāṭ* Skandasvāmin, preceptor of Harisvāmin, the predecessor of the Vikramāditya, king of Ujjayinī, whose minister Harisvāmin later became? Skanda was certainly a Brahmin and the king of Ujjayinī referred to by Yuan Chwang was a Brahmin by caste and highly learned in the Brāhmaṇical scriptures. Harisvāmin calls his patron only a king but his *guru* a *samrāṭ*. Skanda's reign may have come to a close before or about the time of the rise of Harṣa's power and his being a *samrāṭ* does not go against Harṣa's suzerainty in North India between 612 and 647 A.D. The Vikramāditya who patronised Harisvāmin may also have come to the throne before 612 A.D.

Whatever may be the correct date of Skandasvāmin, it has, we must confess, no bearing on the traditional character of the interpretations given in these commentaries, when even Yāska has in many cases indulged in wild guesses. That there was no "traditional" interpretation of the Vedic mantras before Yāska is quite evident from the scepticism of Kautsa referred to and elaborately refuted in the *Nirukta* (I. 15ff.), which we find reflected in the *Pūrva-mīmāṁsā-sūtras* of Jaimini, I. 2. 31-39. We cannot, however, doubt that there was current a continuous tradition about the Vedic ritual.

Coming to the field of Vedic linguistics, I must first mention Dr. Siddheshwar Varma's very full treatment of the "Syntax of the Dative Case in the Ṛgveda" in the *Jha Commemmoration Volume* (Part II, pp. 435-456.) Dr. Mangal Deva Shastri has at last published his long expected translation of the *Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya* with valuable notes and appendices (Lahore, 1937). His use of better manuscripts of Uvvaṭa's commentary has enabled him to improve on Max Müller's translation at a number of places. But it is much to be regretted that he thought it fit to stick as much as he could to the form he gave to his work when a student at Oxford and he failed to utilise fully the writings of recent workers in the field. If, for example, he had cared to read Dr. Siddheshwar Varma's very valuable treatment of the phenomenon of *abhinidhāna* in his *Critical Studies in the Phonetic Observations of Indian Gramnarians* (London, 1929), ch. VIII, Dr. Shastri could not have taken it as 'separate pronunciation of conjunct consonants.' He should have borne in mind the other use of the same term in this and other Prātiśākhyas, *viz.*, for the loss of an initial *a* after a final *e* or *o*, which supports Varma's interpretation. I may also mention the attempt of Dr. Paul Thieme and myself at showing that Pāṇini learnt about Śākalya's views from his *Pada-pāṭha* of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* and not from the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya* of Śaunaka as contended by Max Müller and Dr. Batakrishna Ghosh (*Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol.

XIII, pp. 329-349). Since the publication of those notes I have discovered that we can perhaps trace in Śākalya's *Padapāṭha* the phenomenon envisaged in *Pāṇini* VI. 1. 127, "इकोऽसवर्णे शाकल्यस्य ह्रस्वश्च" also. Cases like वा॒ज्य अ॒क्षः in the *Saṁhitāpāṭha* (X. 34. 4*b*) to be metrically read as वा॒जी-अक्षः and given the *Padapāṭha* as, वा॒जी । अ॒क्षः ।' or उ॒विऽऊतिः (VI. 24. 2) in the *Padapāṭha* itself in place of उ॒र्वीऽऊतिः seem to show the operation of the rule which Pāṇini ascribes to Śākalya. The problem of the relation between Pāṇini and the *Ṛkprātiśākhya* however, has not been solved by any of us and it will for long demand assiduous study. We owe it to Mr. Sadāshiva Lakshmidhara Kātre, Assistant Curator of the Manuscripts Library, Madhava College, Ujjain, the important discovery that the author of the Prātiśākhya of the Atharva school edited by Whitney is Kautsa (*JRAS*, 1937, p. 731) and not Śaunaka. The adjective *Śaunakīya* in the title of Whitney's single manuscript is probably with reference to the *recension* of the *Atharvaveda-saṁhitā* with which it is concerned, as is the *Ṛkprātiśākhya* of Śaunaka with the Śaiśirīya division of the Śākala recension. We cannot yet know if this Kautsa is or is not identical with the Kautsa referred to by Yāska.

Passing on to the subject of Indo-Aryan origins, I may name A.B. Keith's article "Aryan Names in Early Asiatic Records" in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XII. pp. 569-580 in which he has examined N.D. Mironov's paper "Aryan Vestiges in the Near East of the second Millenary B.C." in the *Acta Orientalia*, Vol. XI. pp. 141-217. Professor Keith's conclusions are mainly negative. If Mironov has too readily seen Aryan vestiges or Sanskrit words where there are none, Keith has been unnecessarily sceptical.[8] We cannot agree with him that we are quite unable to prove that the four gods *ilāni* Mi-it-ra-ásh-shil *ilāni* U-ru-va-na-ásh-shi-el

---

[8] E.G. about *Shuriash*, the name of a Kassite deity, glossed as *Shamash* (Sun) in Babylonian, very clearly identical with Skt. *Sūrya*, Av. *Hvard*, L. *Sol.* and Gk. *Helios*.

(v. l. *ilāni* A-runa-ash-shi-il)*ilu* In-da-ra and *ilāni* Na-shà-atti-ia-an-na named in the treaties of the Hittite king Shubbiluliuma and the Mitannian king Mattiuaza found at Boghazkeui, were Indian gods and not gods of an outlying branch of the Aryan family. The very forms and the order of the four names bear an indelible stamp of their Indian origin. Mitra is followed by Varuṇa in the same order as in the Vedas. The name *Varuṇa* is not found outside India. Its equation with Greek *Ouranōs*, though accepted by philologists, must be rejected on account of two differences, the quality of the second vowel and the place of the accent. The second vowel in *Varuṇa* is *u* and it is *a* in *Ouranṓs*. The former word is accented on the first syllable and the latter on the final syllable, though accenting it on the syllable third from the end would not have militated against the special law about the place of the accent in the Greek language. Either discrepancy would not have by itself gone against the equation but their combination makes it extremely difficult to connect *Váruṇa* and *Ouranṓs*. There is also nothing in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* to show that Varuṇa was a sky-god. Similarly, the assumption that Ahura Mazda of the Avesta is the same person as the Indian Varuṇa is a baseless one as the two deities bear distinct names. The simple fact that their characters are similar cannot entitle us to identify them. We could then identify any two similar things under the heavens. The double dual of the *devatā-dvandva Mitrá-Váruṇau* and the use of the dual number for *Mitrá* and *Váruṇa* even outside compounds or of *Váruṇā* alone in dual for both Mitra and Varuṇa, on account of the close association of the two deities in the *Ṛgveda saṁhitā*, must needs be taken as peculiar Indian usage with no trace among any other Aryan people. The phenomenon is faithfully reflected in the Hittite records by the plurals ilāni Mi-it-ra-*á*sh-shi-il and ilāni U-ru-va-na-àsh-shi-el. A language that does not possess the dual number necessarily uses the plural in its place. We should note that the plural determinative *ilāni* has been used before both Mi-it-ra and U-ru-va-na. This as nearly corresponds to Vedic usage as is possible within the limitations of the Akkadian language and the cuneiform syllabary. The variant forms U-ru-va-na and A-ru-na are clearly two distinct attempts at representing the Indian word *Varuṇa*. The name ilāni Na-shá-at-ti-ya-an-na also is given in the plural, corresponding to the dual number of *Nāsatyā* in the Vedas due to the Aśvins being two in number. All this, added to the phonetic forms of the names, which are positively non-Iranian, definitely suggests that we have to do here with the names of some neither proto-Iranian, nor Aryan,but positively *Indian* gods, The Indian numerals in the Hittite treatise on horse-breeding (*Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschajten*, XX, 1919, pp 267-372) suggest the presence of an Indian colony within or near the territory of the Hittites or the Mitannians, probably of merchants trading in horses. We have ample evidence of trade relations between India and Western Asia from the time of the Indus civilization. It is probably these merchants who introduced the Mesopotamian influences in the *Atharvaveda-saṁhitā* to which the late Lokamānya Bal Gangadhar Tilak drew our attention,[9] as also the flood story found in the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* and the *Atharvaveda-saṁhitā*. The occurrence of these four Indian names in inscriptions of about 1350 B.C. thus gives us some hint about the date of the cultural contact between the nations of Western Asia and the Aryans of India. The very obviously Indian character of these four names is denied under the influence of the theory that the Vedas cannot go to a date earlier than or even as early as the fourteenth century B.C. but this theory itself can no longer be upheld. An analytical study of the great development in religious outlook and in the gradual diffusion of the Aryans in India revealed by texts of the Vedas forces on us the conclusion that we cannot place their beginnings in the twelfth century B. C.

Coming to Indo-Iranian times, I may mention that in a paper in the *Journal of the K.R. Cama Oriental Institute*, No. 31, pp. 209-237, I hava tried to show that Martin Haug's theory of an Indo-Iranian schism leading to deliberate changes in

---

9. *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, pp. 33ff.

the religious ideas and terminologies of the two peoples, unfortunately still very popular in India, can no longer be accepted on account of the fuller information about Vedic and Avestic literatures and cultures and about linguistic and religious histories that we possess today. The so-called inversions are only natural developments under differing conditions.

Efforts have continued to be made to prove the Indus civilization as Aryan and Vedic. Dr. Lakshman Sarup has made an elaborate attempt in the *Indian Culture*, Vol. IV, pp. 149-169, to prove that this civilization is "post-Ṛgvedic." Mr. A.D. Pusalkar has tried to show in the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol. XVII, part 4, pp. 385-395, "that there is nothing inconsistent in calling the Vedic Aryans the authors of the Indus Civilization, or styling the civilization as 'Vedic' or 'Aryan'. Another attempt in this direction is that of Mr. S. V. Venkateswara in *The Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. III, pp. 53-63. We have to confess that these scholars have failed to make convincing case. It is true that many of the differences between Vedic culture and the Indus civilization pointed out by Sir John Marshall are either wrong or inconclusive. But two of them make it impossible to take the people of Mohenjo-daro and Harappa as Aryans and they are iconism and the absence of the horse. As the question is of considerable interest to both the student of the Vedas and of ancient Indian history generally, and a wrong view is likely to impede the progress of our studies, I have to enter into a discussion on the essential aspects of the problem.

This first point that I wish to emphasize is that the Vedic religion has been aniconic throughout its history. In spite of the anthropomorphic description (and conception) of the gods in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* we find no clear reference to images of gods in the Vedic texts and, what is of particular significance, *no place for their use in the Vadic sacrifice*. The reference to the barter of Indra in two passages of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* (IV. 24-10 and VIII. 1-5) has to be understood as meaning temporary barter of Indra' favour and not of his icon. The priest procures this favour to his *yajamāna* for consideration received as *dakṣiṇā* (literally 'propitiation').[10] The god Indra as such could not be bartered. It is either his icon or his favour that could be exchanged. In deciding whether Indra's icon or his favour is to be understood in these passages we have to go by the spirit that pervaded the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* and we cannot doubt that the icon is to be ruled out. If iconic representation of Indra or any other deity[11] were known, we would have found traces of it in the Śrauta-sūtras and the Paddhatis. The Indus civilization. on the other hand, is full of vestiges of iconism. We have here a fundamental difference which cannot be explained except through a hypothesis of distinctness of the two cultures. One cannot explain the difference through difference in time, claiming that the non-development of iconism in the Vedic texts is due to a date earlier than the Indus civilization, because the aniconism of the Vedic cult persists down to the latest texts on Vedic rituals and the living traditions on the Vedic *karma-kāṇḍins* who, though using images in *smārta* worship, never use them in *śrauta* ritual: It is as wrong to take the aniconism of the Vedas as an indication of their earlier date and earlier stage in development as to assume that the present day iconic Hinduism has grown out of aniconic Arya Samaj or Brahmo Samaj or Islam er Judaism.

Then, the horse argument is another deciding factor. Not only is a common word for the horse found among most Indo-European languages, definitely pointing towards its being an "Indo-European" animal, we find in history that wherever the Indo-European peoples went in antiquity they introduced this animal, which gave them an easy ascendancy over nations which did not possess it.[12] We cannot suppose that things were different for the Aryan invaders of India. It is too late in the day to suppose that the Aryans were autochthonous in India. It is really distressing to find that there are many scholars in our country who are oblivious of the philological grounds on which Aryan migration from outside has been definitely established. The ancestors of the Vedic Aryans certainly came from outside. They must have brought the horse with them. We find the Vedic texts full of references to this noble animal. We cannot for a moment doubt its popularity among the Vedic Aryans. But in the Indus basin we have found so far only two fragments of the jaw of a horse, discovered very near the surface (at a depth of 1 ft. 10 in. only)[13], probably coming from a late period, and one horse-like terracotta figure belonging to the Late Second Period.[14] That is all. We have no other evidence. The exceptions only prove the rule. The Indus people have represented faithfully and lovingly the images of so many animals in their seals. It cannot be understood how they could have left out their favourite horse if these people were Aryans. The fragmentary skeletal remains of a horse found so far may be of a stray animal that was brought by traders of Mohenjo-daro from some other place, say Anau, where the horse was in use in antiquity and which shows signs of probable cultural affinity with the people of the Indus basin. In fact Col. R.B.S. Sewell has pointed out the close similarity between the Mohenjo-daro specimen and the breed of horses found in ancient Anau.[15] Even if a few more skeletal remains are found we can give the same explanation, as we must also for the toy model that has been found already. Besides, as the ears are missing in the latter the possibility remains that we have only an onager here and not a horse. So long as seals with clear representation of horses and more skeletal remains of undoubted lower lever are not found we must hold that the animal was not known or in general use in the Indus basin. It may be said that such seals and skeletal remains may yet be found. But let them be found first. We shall then change our hypothesis too. In the meanwhile the theory that the Indus civilization is non-Aryan must hold the field.

---

[10] Can it be believed that the priests were the *makers* of icons which they could give away or withhold as they chose? For securing the favours of gods they were certainly the only accredited agents.

[11] There is no "central figure of a god" in *Taitt. Saṁ.* V. 3.1.5, as Mr. Venkateswara assumes (pp. 56, 61). The *puruṣa* referred to there is 'man' and not 'a god'. The passage refers to the construction of the Fire Altar (*Agni cayana*). No effigies of men or animals are used here but certain bricks only. They are arranged in a particular order to the accompaniment of certain mantras which refer to animals and man to ensure man's control over those animals.

---

[12] See J. von Negelein, *Das Pfedim arischen Altertum*, Koenigsberg 1903 and I.J.S. Taraporewala, 'The Horse in Indo-European Languages' in *Sir Asutosh Memorial Volume*, Part I, pp. 302-315.

[13] Sir John Marshall, *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization*, II, pp. 653-4.

[14] *Archaeological Survey of India. Annual Report*, 1928-29, p. 74.

[15] *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization*, II p. 654.

These are my reasons for refusing to take the Indus civilization as Aryan. *Maṇḍana* of *svamata* done, I may now attempt a brief *khaṇḍana* of *para-mata*. I shall confine myself to Dr. Lakshman Sarup whose treatment of the problem is the most systematic of the efforts made during the last two years. He has used five main arguments for disproving the non-Aryan character of the Indus civilization or proving their post-Ṛg-vedic date (*Indian Culture*, Vol. IV, pp. 150-169). I may examine them one by one.

(1) Dr. Sarup points out that the human skulls found at Mohenjo-daro show four different types according to Sewell and Guha and he thinks that none of them is Dravidian (p. 152). I reply that 'non-Aryan' need not necessarily mean 'Dravidian' and also that we know *nothing* about the primitive Dravidian physical type. We have no justification for assuming that the Dravidian has preserved his distinctive features unaltered during the last 5000 years (p. 154). In any case, present day anthropologists say that "there are many points of resemblance between the Dravidian and Mediterranean people which point to an ancient connection between the two, perhaps due to a common origin" (A.C. Haddon, *The Races of Man*, 1924, p. 109)[16] and certainly Mediterranean is one of the types represented at Mohenjo-daro[17] as Dr. Sarup is himself aware (p. 152).

(2) Dr. Sarup is mainly correct in the differences he has shown (pp. 156-9) between the civilization of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* ("a village, agricultural and pastoral civilization")

---

[16] The older "official" account of the Dravidian type, *e.g.*, in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, 1909 ? Vol. I. p. 298 is wholly imaginary.

[17] *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization*, II, pp. 642-3.

and that of Mohenjo-daro ("a city and a commercial civilization"). This really goes against his own position. We cannot claim that the latter civilization has grown out of the former unless we can *first* prove that the two peoples are identical and the date of Mohenjo-daro is later. The whole of Dr. Sarup's argumentation is vitiated by the fact that he has just *assumed* what he should have first *proved*. The argument based on the prevalence of writing at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa and its supposed absence in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* (p. 169) has no probative value for the same reason. I may add that I have tried to show that *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* X. 71. 4 suggests the knowledge of writing (*Poona Orientalist*, Vol. 1 no 4, pp. 47 ff.).

(3) Dr. Sarup is conscious of the fact that phallic worship was very much in prevalence in the Indus basin and that it seems to be referred to with disapproval in two passages of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* (p. 159). He claims that the *śiśnadevas* were *Aryan* phallic worshippers. But why ? How can we say that the "barbarians or the non-Aryans were beyond the pale of the Aryan *dharma* and could not therefore penetrate to the sanctuary of the Aryans" ? Our old texts clearly indicate that the Ancient Aryan was not so exclusive as the orthodox Hindu of the present day. The sages performing a *sattra* on the bank of the Sarasvatī who cruelly drove away the non-Brahmin Kavaṣa Ailūṣa from their company gladly recalled him when they found that he had composed a hymn (*RV. X.* 30) and had received the favour of the gods (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII. 1).[18] Patañjali in the second century B. C. includes the Śakas and the Yavanas among *śūdras* whose dinner plates could be used by "āryas" just after cleansing them, unlike Caṇḍālas and Mṛtapas (*Mahābhāṣya*, II. 4. 10). Both these ideas would be repugnant to the present day orthodoxy. There is not the least evidence that the Aryans of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*

---

[18] Bṛbu, the chief of the Paṇis(?), whose gifts to the priest Bharadvāja are commemorated in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* (VI. 45. 31-33), is believed to have been a non-Aryan. The matter is, however, extremely obscure.

did not allow non-Aryans to come near their sacrifices. If they had such notions of exclusiveness, they could not have gradully assimilated the non-Aryans as they certainly seem to have done. Consequently the assumption that the *śiśnadevas* forbidden admittance to the holy rite in *ṚV*. VII. 21. 5, were Aryans seems to be historically unsound. We cannot therefore contend that the phallicism of the Indus basin is a development out of some Aryan phallic cult. The obscenities in connexion of the Aśvamedha sacrifice vouched by the Yajurvedic texts to which Dr. Sarup makes reference (pp. 161-155) have absolutely nothing to do with phallic worship. The phallus was used as a divine symbol only to stress in a rather unconventional manner the creative aspect of God and not to glorify lust.

(4) Dr. Sarup's statement that "gods at Mohenjo-daro had been completely anthropomorphized, but this process had not gone very far during the period of the *ṚV*." (p. 167), and the consequent deduction cannot be accepted. It is not true that the gods of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* did not have a distinct and clear-cut individuality. They had it quite all right. Otherwise attempts would not have been occasionally made by the Vedic seers to show that their favourite gods were superior to other gods or distinction would not have been made between the different spheres of deities like Indra and Varuṇa, That the phenomenon of what Max Müller called henotheism was present in the mind of the Vedic poets does not show that the gods had no individuality of their own. This henotheistic tendency has been as present in all later Hinduism as in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* and a Hindu worshipper even today praises his *iṣṭa-devatā* or the deity he may be worshipping at the time being as the highest god. It is due to this tendency that Hinduism has been able to evolve that monotheism in polytheism which we do not find elsewhere. It is just because the Vedic gods were anthropomorphically conceived and endowed with distinct personality that several scholars have been led to assume that they were also iconically represented. The gods of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* were quite clearly anthropomorphised though not iconised too.

(5) Dr. Sarup says that Śiva is a subordinate deity in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* but is an important god at Mohenjo-daro and therefore the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* is of earlier date (pp. 165-167) This argument is based on a number of misconceptions. First of all, the Indus god is not actually Śiva but only his historical counterpart. Sir John Marshall whom Dr. Sarup quotes calls him only the "*prototype* of the historic Śiva". Nor is the Vedic deity Rudra the same personality exactly as the Purāṇic Śiva. He too appears to be distinct from but in certain respect the prototype of the late Śiva. Then, the alleged importance of the so-called Śiva in the Indus religion is wholly problematic. We have so far one single terracotta plaque representing the deity whom Sir John Marshall calls the prototype of Śiva (DK 5175 —*Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report,* 1921-29, Pl. XXVIIIf.) We do not even know if it was the same god or some other who was so frequently represented by the phallic emblem. In spite of the comparatively small number of passages in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* where Rudra is praised or referred to, it is not right to say that he was an altogether unimportant god. The epithet *asura* that he shares along with some other great gods shows that he was not an insignificant deity. In fact, he seems to have been an old thunder god, whose importance was declining, probably on account of the rise of Indra's importance or of usurpation by Indra of Rudra's character as a thunder god. There is not the least indication of the Indus god being in any way associated with the phenomenon of thunder. The Purāṇic Śiva seems to have been formed from a number of diverse elements. Nobody claims that Śiva was a god *borrowed from the non-Aryans* (p. 167). What is believed by scholars is that he was formed by a fusion of the Aryan Rudra with some non-Aryan deity or deities. One such non-Aryan deity now appears to be the three-faced (or four-faced ?) contemplative god surrounded by animals represented by the plaque found by Dr. Mackay at Mohenjo-daro. We do not yet clearly understand how the Vedic Rudra came to be identified with this Indus god. Was it because Rudra was

*Paśupati*, 'lord of the cattle'[19] and this Indus god also seems to have been connected with animals? A phallic deity has also entered into the composition of the later Śiva. Some trait common between the Vedic thundergod Rudra and some phallic deity may also be perhaps discerned, Meteoric stones have been connected with thunder or taken as an emblem of a thunder god by several peoples (C. Blinkenberg, *The Thunder weapon in Religion and Folklore*) and it is easy to identify phallic stones with meteoric stones and through them the deities whom they symbolise. Thus the later Śiva may be a blend of at least three distinct deities, the Vedic Rudra, a non-Aryan phallic deity and the contemplative god of Mohenjo-daro. The Vedic god has supplied the name (*Rudra*), the terrible nature and the thunder symbol (the *triśūla*) and other traits may have come from other sources. In any case, Dr. Sarup's contention that the Mohenjo-daro prototype of Śiva is a development out of the Rudra of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* cannot be accepted.

Aryan origin of the Indus civilization has been inferred by others from the supposed priority in age of the Vedas. This argument is unconvincing as that priority itself has not been established. I have said that we cannot bring down the beginning of the Vedas to the twelfth century B.C. but no definite evidence has been put forward so far for their existence in the fourth and the fifth millenia B.C. (11000 B.C. according to Mr. Venkateswara !) either. The interpretations put on a number of astronomical passages in the Vedic texts by Tilak, Jacobi and others to prove their antiquity are not supported by their contexts and admit of much simpler explanations. I have shown (*Allahabad University Studies*, Vol. 1, 1925, pp. 97-156) that Vṛṣākapi of *ṚV*. S. X. 86 is neither the Orion, nor the Sun in the Orion on the occasion of the vernal equinox, but simply the Sun without reference to any constellation. Similarly, the interpretation of *ṚV*. *X*. 85 13 in conjunction with VII. 103 9 and some other passages referring to the Sun's conjunction with the Phalgunīs at the time of the summer solstice, when the new year is supposed to have begun, cannot be accepted because at each stage assumptions are made that cannot be substantiated. First of all, दे॒वहि॑तिं जुगुपुर्द्वाद॒शस्य॑ of VII. 103. 9, referring to the breaking of monsoons regularly at the end of twelve months, does not necessarily show that a new calendar year began at this point. The fact remains that since last year's beginning of the rains twelve months have elapsed. Similar statements could be made about events in any part of the year that recur after twelve months. That the twelfth month here is the twelfth month of the calendar year is not given by the text.[20] In fact other texts (*Taittirīya-saṁhitā* VII. 4.8.1-2 and *Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa* V. 9. 9) suggest that the year began with the Full Moon of Phālguna. Then, we do not know if the setting out of the bride Sūryā "in the Phalgunīs" referred to in *ṚV*.*X*. 85. 13, also synchronises with the beginning of the calendar year. We do not clearly understand what astronomical or seasonal phenomenon, if any, is referred to here. But this much is sure that it cannot refer to the summer solstice for after that the *decline* of the Sun commences as he now passes on to the southern hemisphere, whereas the bridal chariot of Sūryā is said to begin its *progress* from this point. Then, we do not know if we are to take the reference to Maghā and the Phalgunīs as in conjunction with the Sun or with the Moon. Soma, who is certainly the Moon in *ṚV*. *X*. 85, is described here as the wooer of the bride (v. 9)

---

[19] Why Rudra was *paśupati* we do not know. Macdonell says that this epithet was given to him "because unhoused cattle are peculiarly exposed to his attacks and are therefore especially consigned to his care" (*Vedic Mythology*, p. 75). I have a different hypothesis to offer. There are several indications of the old Vedic thunder-god Rudra having been identified with Fire or House-Fire. The Hearth-Fire has been conceived by several peoples as a protector of the cattle of the house (cf. W.R.S. Ralston, *The Songs of the Russian People*, pp. 125 f. about the Russian Spirit of the Hearth-Fire (*Domovoy*). Rudra seems to have similarly got associated with cattle.

---

20. It is immaterial whether we interpret द्वा॒दशस्य॑ as द्वादशस्य मासस्य or as द्वादशधा विभक्तस्य संवत्सरस्य.

and there would be therefore, nothing wrong in understanding reference to the Full Moon of Maghā or Phalgunī in this passage. There would then be an agreement with *TS.* VII. 4. 8. 1-2 and *TMB.* V. 9. 9. referred to above. We should note that the Taittirīya and Tāṇḍya passages give us no clear indication about the season, *i.e.* the Moon's position relative to the Sun, at the time of the Full Moon of Phālguna or Caitra. In view of all these uncertainties, Jacobi's deductions from *ṚV.* VII. 103. 9 and X. 85. 13 seem to be extremely doubtful.

Similar uncertainties attach to the Kṛttikā, the Dhruva and the other arguments that have been advanced for proving a high antiquity for the Vedas. I cannot enter here into an examination of all these arguments. I may mention here only one point. We cannot be sure that the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* as a relatively late text in the Vedic period and 2500 B C. would be much too early a date for this work. Persons who have attempted dating of the Vedas on astronomical ground have often not only failed to use proper circumspection but have generally kept these historical considerations absolutely out of their views. The result is that their conclusions have often landed us in anachronisms. One may be therefore, pardoned if one takes up an attitude of scepticism about these astronomical arguments. The astronomical data in the Vedas have yet to be thoroughly worked out by persons who are not only good astronomers but know the Vedic texts well and can historically handle them. As regards the knowing of the Vedic texts, it must include a clear knowledge of the ritual in connexion with which the *mantras* or the *brāhmaṇas* are given Till such work is done and it makes a date like the fourth or the fifth millenium B. C. probable for the literature of the Vedas, we should not assume that the Vedas or the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* are anterior to the Indus civilization. In the present state of our knowledge, the beginnings of the Vedic. literature may be placed about 2000 or 2500 B.C.

---

21. The attempt of Dr. Gorakh Prasad in this direction in *JRAS*, 1936 pp. 417-421 is unsuccessful.

Though we may not be able to take the Indus civilization as post-Vedic or Aryan in origin, the student of the Vedas has still to try to understand that civilization on account of the possibility of its influencing Vedic thought in its later phases. No culture can ever remain absolutely unaffected by its environment. The Vedic Aryans too must have been influenced by the pre-Aryan civilization of India when they settled down in this land and came into intimate touch with its people. One element that they seem to have thus imbibed is the practice of *yoga* in that technical manner which is characteristic of India, of which ample vestige has been found at Mohenjo-daro. It is thus that *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* X. 136, a very late passage, describes the *Keśins* or the longhaired ascetics with their yogic powers that enabled them to move in space[22] and the *Kaṭha* and other Upaniṣads are steeped in *yoga*. The *tapas* that the Brāhmaṇa texts speak of again in connexion with the creative activity of Prajāpati seems to mean this very *yoga* or is closely connected with it. We are indebted to Rai Bahadur Ramaprasad Chanda for first pointing out that yogic practices were very much in vogue at Mohenjo-daro.[23] This great achievement of the Indian mind, which we find already reflected in the later Vedic texts, thus appears to be a gift of non-Aryan civilization.[24] Closer study and fuller understanding of this culture may reveal other point of contact or mutual influencing of the two civilizations. What little we have been able to learn so far clearly suggests that it is futile to trace to the early Vedic ideas all the new doctrines that we find emerging in the Upaniṣads, for there was a distinct non-Vedic source that probably made important contributions to the synthesis of the Upaniṣads.

---

[22] They are called वातरशनाः or 'air-girdled' in verse 2, which cannot be interpreted as 'sky-clad' because the *munis* are described in the same verse as putting on tawny-coloured filthy clothes (पिशङ्गा वसते मला).

[23] *Survival of the Pre-historic Civilization of the Indus Valley* (*Memoirs, Archaeological Survey of India*) and 'Sindh Five Thousand Years Ago' (*Modern Review*, August 1932, pp. 151-160). See also my own paper in the Bengali journal *Pravāsī*, Māgha 1344, pp. 557-563.

[24] This ought not to shock us. Why should we assume that the Aryans are the best creations of God ? The Aryan superstition has for long impeded the progress of history and it is high time that it should be given a decent burial. No particular sanctity is imparted to *yoga* by the assumption that it is an "Aryan" institution. It is not an "Aryan" but an "Indian" invention, an invention of this famous *karma-bhūmi*.

This is all about the work that has been already done. Let us now look ahead. We have work to do. Unpublished texts on Vedic rituals or phonetics or exegesis have to be published. But our efforts should not stop there. The more important work is the interpretation of these texts. We are under very heavy debt to the European and American students of the Vedas for the valuable work that they have done and particularly for the historical method that they have introduced into these studies. We cannot, however, rest contented with the work they have done but must go ahead ourselves. There is, on the one hand, much new ground to cover. There is, on the other, the need for the re-study of all that our Western friends have done, as is evident from what has been said above in connexion with the meaning of the words *dásyu* and *dāsá*. But like the Western scholars we should approach these studies in a critical spirit and not in that of traditional bias. We should know the tradition certainly and utilise it wherever there is justification for its use. But we must examine the credentials of each and every tradition. Not everything that is given in any Sanskrit text or uttered by a Pandit can be accepted as an unbroken tradition coming from the oldest antiquity. If it were so, quite contrary views would not have been also found in other Sanskrit texts. Consequently, we should not be slaves of "tradition".

We should study the Vedas not in isolation but in comparison with similar literatures and institutions in other lands. Special attention should be paid by the student of the Vedas to the literature of the Avesta. Vedic and Avestic literatures are likely to throw light on each other for a long time. I may add here one word of caution. It is often assumed whenever we find the same deities or institutions in both the Veda and the Avesta that they are inheritances of the period of Indo-Iranian unity. In many cases this must be so but we should not assume that this is so in every case. The Indians and the Iranians were next door neighbours. Consequently they must have had immense opportunites of borrowing from each other. The common things are, therefore, not necessarily old survivals : Consequently, the evidence of the Avesta should be used by the student of the Vedas with a good deal of circumspection. Anthropology, as the Science of Man, is sure to shed much welcome light on the meanings of the human institutions reflected in the Vedas. The excavations made in Western Asia during the last thirty years have made it impossible for us to believe that the Vedic Aryan could have remained unaffected by other cultures. Consequently we must have full knowledge of the histories and the civilizations of other nations of antiquity, particularly of Western Asia, Egypt and the Mediterranean world. A word of warning may be added here too : we are apt to misunderstand the lessons of history if we study it only for proving or disproving a particular theory.[25] History should be studied independently of theories.

Then we must possess and utilize the knowledge of later development in India. There has been in spite of great changes a good deal of continuity in the cultural history of this land. Later developments may, therefore, sometimes throw much light on older institutions. This can be said particularly about religion, for religious ideas are found sticking to a nation's mind with great tenacity. One western scholar has gleaned from modern Greek folklore some information about ancient Greek religion.[26] A study of modern Indian folklore is expected to be still more helpful in the understanding of ancient Indian religion and mythology. Of course, we have always to bear in mind, what we unfortunately often forget in India, that the later institution may be and generally is quite

[25] I have had bitter experience of this in some of my own earlier speculations.

[26] J.C. Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, Cambridge, 1910.

different from the older one with which it bears some resemblance. Consequently if we want to explain the past always in the light of the present, we would often arrive at anachronous results. We have, therefore, to use considerable circumspection in utilising the indications of later times. But if we are careful and we do not lose a sense of history when taking into account these later developments, we can hope to come to safe conclusions.

Leaving these general remarks, let us now come down to some specific problems. I have given above some illustrations of the methods just advocated. Some others will also appear below. Regarding the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, which has received greater attention than the other Vedic texts, we have yet a lot of work to do. Though the meaning of a good part of it is quite clear there remains a fairly large portion which has baffled successful interpretation. We should continue to make efforts to understand these passages. I personally feel that the time has not yet come for a comprehensive Indian translation of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*. Of European works, Grassmann's and Ludwig's were pioneer efforts and these scholars are entitled to our best thanks for the ground they have cleared. But they have failed to interpret successfully quite a number of passages. The great Geldner, who began his efforts at the translation of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* as early as 1875 (in Roth's *Siebezieg Lieder*) and had raised high hopes in our minds from the penetrating studies in the *Vedische Studien*, has not wholly fulfilled those expectations in the comprehensive translation that he finished before his death, of which one volume was published in 1922. Macdonell who had also planned a complete translation of this difficult text and who spent like Geldner his whole lifetime in its understanding could leave in more or less final form only a small portion of his efforts (the hymns addressed to Uṣas, published in *JRAS*, 1932., Pp. 347-371). All this shows the immensity of the task. I would therefore suggest that competent scholars in India instead of taking up a complete translation of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* at the present moment should direct their efforts to the interpretation of individual words and passages. The *Vedic Studies* of Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah and Dr. Tarapada Chowdhury's *On the interpretation of some Doubtful Words in the Atharva-veda* are efforts in the right direction. Though Professor V. K. Rajavade has been able to rise above the spell of Pāṇini and Sāyaṇa in his *Words in Ṛgveda*, Vol. I, the work does not show that he understands the right philological approach to such a task and he often needlessly differs from older views. It is doubtful if it is possible to achieve any measure of success in interpreting the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* without a full use of the lessons of comparative philology. To give one example, little value attaches to a discussion on the meaning of the word *kratu* (p. 193) which does not take into account the use of the corresponding word (*khratu*) in the Avesta.[27] We should have more and more "Vedic Studies" of the right sort. But this is not enough. We must have discussions among scholars on the results achieved in these "Studies". We have now a journal solely devoted to the Vedas, *The Journal of Vedic Studies*, ably edited by Dr. Raghu Vira, and may we not hope that such "Studies" and discussions will form a special feature of this journal ?

Knowledge of comparative philology, though essential for the understanding of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, is not enough. The *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* is a religious text and no effort at its interpretation can be satisfactory if its religion and mythology are not specially studied. The assumption that is often unfortunately made about its being earlier in its entirety to the rest of the Vedic literature cannot be justified. Though a good portion of the text is very early, there is still much that belongs to the times of the Yajurveda and the Brāhmaṇas and some portion comes down to the very latest age in the Vedic period[28] Consequently a good part of the work is pervaded by the atmosphere of the ritualism of the Yajurveda and the Brāhmaṇas. A knowledge of the Vedic ritual therefore becomes essential for the full understanding of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, though most of its hymns lack that definite place in the developed ritual which is characteristic of the mantras of the Yajurveda. An analytical study of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* from the point of view of the ritual is a great desideratum. There is still much room for work on the grammar of this text. It contains many instances of case confusion, due to case attraction or reasons which cannot be understood. An intensive study of these case confusions is likely to shed much light on the chronology of the texts. It will probably show that as in the case of the Younger Avesta grammatical irregularities are generally a feature of late date, when the language used by the poets had gone out of actual use. There are many other things to study in this great text.

---

[27] If Professor Rajavade had cared the least for comparative philosophy, he could not have "corrected" his own correct rendering of स॒न॒श्रुत॒ 'ever known' (p. 105), into the impossible 'rich one' (p. 319) ! Not only has the Professor neglected to use comparative philology, he has not even cared to look into the accents of the word he is interpreting. If he had done it he could not have made a short of shrift. Śākalya had interpreted वृश्नि॒रश्मा॑ in ṚV. 47.3 as one word (p. 84). One may not accept Pāṇini but the Vedic or any other language cannot be supposed to be free from all limitations of grammar, entitling us to interpret it in any way we choose. It is not by such unscientific efforts that we can hope to supercede the work done by our Western colleagues.

Similar attention should be paid to the other Vedic texts. The Yajurveda is very important from the Indian point of view. We have to try to understand the interrelation of the various portions (*mantra* or *brāhmaṇa*) of the Yajurvedic texts and the Brāhmaṇas of the other Vedas. It is only after intensive work done by a band of scholars on these problems that we shall begin to understand the history of Vedic rituals. Our efforts will be very well directed towards this end. There are fortunately still living in South India several Vaidikas who possess traditional knowledge of the different Vedic sacrifices and have themselves performed or officiated as priests in a number of them. We should utilise their knowledge in understanding the details of the sacrifice. This is a work which we Indians alone can do properly. Work on the history of Vedic sacrifices will be of great value from the point of view of cultural anthropology. It is hoped that the new edition of the Taittirīya text, rearranged according to the needs of the ritual, that the Mīmāṁsā Granth Prakāśikā Samiti has taken in hand, will, when published, greatly facilitate the study of the Vedic ritual. Though the *Atharvaveda-saṁhitā* is not really concerned with either Brahman, the Absolute of the Upaniṣads, or with Brahman, the superintendiug priest of the sacrificial ritual (in spite of the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* and the *Vaitāna Sūtra*), it is not so different from the other Vedas as is often assumed. Much of it treats of matter that we do not find elsewhere, but there is also a good deal of common material too. Even so-called magical mantras and practices are not lacking in the other Vedas. It would be, therefore, not right to suppose that the tradition of the Atharvaveda came from a quite distinct stratum of the society. A thorough study of the magical conceptions whether found in the Atharvaveda or in the other Vedas is a great necessity.

---

[28] See my paper 'The Place of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* in the chronology of Vedic Literature' in the *Proceedings of the Eighth All-India Oriental Conference*.—Part II, pp. 31-40, also appearing in the present Studies Volume.

In spite of much work that has been already done by Western scholars on Vedic religion and mythology, there is still a lot of work to do. Renou and Benveniste have through their brilliant essay, *Vṛtra et Vṛthragna*, lately called into question much that was being assumed without proper examination. Their work has made it necessary that we should re-examine the meanings of the words *Vṛtra*, *Vṛtrahan*, *Verethraghna* and *Indra*. Was killing of a dragon original to Vṛtrahan—Verethraghna as B. Geiger believed on account of the Armenian Vahagan or was it the aspect of a quite different god as Renou and Benveniste suggest? This and many other questions require to be answered. I believe that a more searching examination of the Vedic texts, which are certainly older in date than the Avesta, will enable us to properly co-ordinate the Indian, the Iranian and the Armenian testimonies. Similar work about other gods is also necessary. We have not yet solved the problem of Varuṇa. If he was not a sky god, what was he then? His constant association with Mitra, a god of light, is to be kept in mind when speculating about the original nature of Varuṇa. We should also remember that he is a god of the sea and a lord of the western direction in the later tradition. He appears to be a water spirit already in the Śunaḥśepa story found in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta-sūtra*. Promising of the first-born to a water spirit, anger of the spirit at non-fulfilment of the promise and attempts at dodging the deity—at Gaṅgāsāgar Bengali mothers used to pick up the child immediately after throwing it in the water—are phenomena well known in Indian and foreign folk-lore and make the true character of Varuṇa in the Śunaḥśepa story quite clear. But in the early hymns of the Ṛgveda he is certainly not a water spirit. He appears there as some sort of god of light, alertly watching the doings of man and punishing him for his misdeeds. We have to explain how this god of light comes to be later associated with waters and the western direction.

Then there are the Aśvins, whose original nature has given rise to a good deal of speculation. One theory advanced by some scholars is that they represented the Morning Star and the Evening Star. But this is impossible. It may not have been understood by the ancients that the Morning Star and the Evening Star are not two stars but only one (the planet Venus). But they must have experienced that the Morning Star and the Evening Star are never seen together, that when one is seen the other is not visible and *vice versa*. But the Aśvins are described as going together. Hence they cannot represent the Morning Star and the Evening Star. The light offered by Greek mythology is of doubtful value in this point. The text of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* makes it abundantly clear that the Aśvins represent the first gleams of light in the early morning, that they are heralds announcing the near approach of the Sun. Though this text assigns to them the use of a chariot, as for all other important persons, the name suggests that they were originally conceived as riders. The idea, therefore, seems to be that they were conceived as outriders going in front of the Sun. Here we get help from an unexpected source. The well known relief in the old *vihāra* at Bhaja, near Poona, representing the Sun moving in his chariot includes two riders on the two sides of the chariot.[29] The two riders seem to be the Aśvins corroborating our interpretation of these gods as outriders of the Sun. The sense of perspective not having properly developed at the time when these early reliefs were executed, the riders appear on the sides and not in front. Otherwise, they are clearly outriders. Though the Vedic Aryans themselves never made any images of their gods, the anthropomorphic conceptions persisted down to the historical times when iconic representation came into vogue. Thus archaeology of the historical period may be used with profit by the student of Vedic religion. Closely connected with the Aśvins is Uṣas, the goddess of dawn. Hopkins, not being able to enter into the spirit of a religion very far removed from his, assumed that Uṣas was worshipped in a certain period of the Aryan occupation of India *because* in the area occupied by the Aryans dawns were beautiful.[30] But can beauty by itself form the basis of religious worship? Such a fundamental misconception about the basis of worship is really astounding. Beauty can rouse aesthetic admiration and not veneration. It can at best aid the feeling of reverence which must be already present in its own right. The Uṣas hymns in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* clearly show that the *ṛṣis* had a genuinely worshipful attitude to the bounteous goddess of dawn. These sages were grateful to the goddess on account of the many good things (among them, *dakṣiṇā* to the priest) that she ushered in and the terrors of the night that she removed by her advent. A real or imagined *arthakriyākāritva* must be the basis of all religious personification.

It is not possible for us to understand the fundamental conceptions of Vedic or any other religion in the tourist way. The psychological implications must be carefully studied. We must, therefore, deeply regret that Dr. P.S. Deshmukh, the only Indian scholar to attempt a general survey of the Vedic religion, did not try to re-study in the light of Indian thought a wrong notion about the beginnings of religion thoughtlessly given currency to by Marett and Farnell, *viz.* the theory of *animatism*, as against *animism*. Not only that, Dr. Deshmukh has even read it into the Vedas (*Religion in Vedic Literature*, pp. 118ff.). He may have ignored Bādarāyaṇa, अभिमानिव्यपदेशस्तु विशेषानुगतिभ्याम्, (*Brahma-sūtra* II. 1.5) who has correctly pointed out that where the Upaniṣads speak of the actions of certain apparently inanimate objects we are to understand them as belonging to certain spirits owning those objects. But do not the Vedic hymns themselves make it clear that the gods were distinct from their physical bases, if they had any ? How else could a *ṛṣi* invite Agni *to come*, when the physical fire was already there ? We may go further back. When we find that even the cave man tried to propitiate the dead, some sort of distinction between body and spirit is clearly authenticated for the most primitive stage of human development of which we have any evidence. It is, therefore, wrong to hold that in the beginning material objects were believed to be themselves animate, instead of being indwelt by spirits. This theory arises from the fact that statements are sometimes made as if no distinction is made between the material body and the indwelling spirit or soul. But this is simply because ordinarily we think only in terms of visual impressions and what is not visualised is difficult to realise. That does not mean that we cannot have an ideation of what we do not visualise. A distinction between *śarīra* and *ātman* is rooted in our convictions today. But do we not often speak or behave as if we identified them ?[31] If we are not animatists today, nor were so the writers of the Vedic hymns in antiquity. An Indian scholar who lives in the midst of living forms of all kinds of religious belief, from the highest monotheism or pantheism to the lowest fetishism, ought to be well qualified to understand the nature of religion.

---

[29] Fergusson and Burgess, *The Cave Temples of India*, Plate XCVIII, *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, Pl. XXVI, 70, Coomarswamy, *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*. Pl. VII, 24. Sir John Marshall's scepticism about Sūrya being the central figure in the relief (*Cambridge History of India*, I, p. 638) cannot be justified.

[30] *JAOS*. 19, part 2, p. 28.

Babylonian influence has been traced in the moral aspect of the Vedic Ādityas. But is this not an uncalled-for assumption? Are not Ādityas powers of light necessarily connected with the idea of watchfulness over men's doings? It seems to my mind that there is a necessary psychological connexion between the idea of a power of light and that of the discovery of sins, and therefore of the guardianship over morals. We find this reflected in our literature, in our songs and even in our swearings ('by the Sun' or 'by the Sun and Moon', or 'by Fire' or even 'by the burning *cilam*'). Consequently the connexion between the Ādityas, Mitra and Varuṇa, and watchfulness over people's morals appears to be a necessary one and independent of the connexion between the Babylonian sun-god Shamsh and righteousness. The same connexion we find among many other nations, *e.g.* not only among the ancient Egyptians, who may have been culturally connected with the ancient Babylonians, but also among the modern Ainus, who have no contact with Babylonian civilization, past or present. Hence a diffusionist hypothesis will not suit the problem of the moral guardianship of the Ādityas. A hypothesis of borrowing of an idea or institution from another nation can be justified only when (1) that idea cannot be explained through ordinary human psychology or the history of the "borrowing" nation *and* (2) we can show that the two nations came into actual contact. The first condition is not fulfilled here.

---

[31] Compare the remarks of Śaṅkarācārya in the *adhyāsa-bhāṣya* of his *Śārīraka Bhāṣya*.

We may have one more illustration of how our present day experiences can throw light on old Vedic ideas. The meaning of the word *tapas* which occurs frequently in the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads has exercised the minds of several European scholars and of at least one Indian scholar.[32] The etymology of the word points towards the sense of 'heat', whereas careful study of the contexts of the passages where the word occurs shows us that it means some practice that gives one mysterious power. Prajāpati creates everything by *tapas*. *Tapas* seems to have thus meant either *yoga* or some practice closely connected with *yoga*. *Yoga* has been believed to give one the power to create anything one chooses. Is there

[32] *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. IX, pp. 104-6.

any connexion between 'heat' and *'yoga'* ? The answer ought to be in the affirmative. Yoga does generate or add heat or "electrical energy" in the body and this can be easily verified today.[33] Yogic energy was thus called 'heat'. Later religious developments in India and even present-day ideas may be thus profitably used for the study of Vedic religion, besides Comparative Religion and Comparative Mythology.

But there is one work which must be done and done immediately and that is the saving from impending disappearance of those Śrautins who have faithfully handed down to us in a practically unaltered conditton the texts of the Vedas. We owe them a heavy debt of gratitude for their selfless efforts. The existence of printed texts of the Vedas may make one suppose that there is no longer any need for such living codices. But all who have at one time or other had occasion to use these wonderful codices for settling phonetical problems in Vedic texts will agree with me that they can never lose their value. We cannot anticipate what fresh problems will arise in future in Vedic phonetics and we cannot, therefore, tap these Śrautins once for all. The class must be consequently preserved for reference whenever their services may be required. You cannot make gramophone records from the *vedapāṭha* of the really good Śrautin, for his orthodoxy will not allow him to agree to this kind of reproduction. You may not have appreciation for his orthodoxy but that is his rooted conviction and we cannot get away from the fact. The unorthodox Śrautin who can accommodate himself to modern ideas is necessarily a man lacking a firm grip on the correct tradition. He will be thus of no use to us. We have, therefore, to keep the torch of orthodox tradition constantly burning. This can be done only if the better class of Śrautins are maintained and allowed to live in dignity and transmit to their sons and pupils the old tradition and not forced to direct their sons to more lucrative studies. If this is not done the Vedic tradition is sure to perish soon.

---

[33] I noticed it in the person of my Guru, the late Svāmi Mahānanda Giri, "Pitāji Mahārāja", and we all have some faint experience of it in our daily *sandhyā vandana*, particularly when we perform it sitting on woollen or silken seats and wearing silken or woollen clothes.

# CHAPTER IV

## REFERENCE TO WRITING IN THE ṚGVEDA-SAṀHITĀ

अक्षरं परमं ब्रह्म स्वात्माभिन्नं विभावयन् ।
बाह्वृचे संहिताग्रन्थेऽक्षरोल्लेखं प्रदर्शये ॥

Dr. Lakshman Sarup is of the opinion that the Indus Civilization as revealed at Mohenjodaro and Harappa is posterior to the *Ṛgveda-samhitā*.[1] An adequate discussion of his arguments must of necessity wait till the full publication of his views. In the meanwhile I wish to make some remarks on one point which can be treated briefly and will prove of general interest to students of Indian antiquity.

An argument used by Dr. Lakshman Sarup for proving the priority of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* is that it knows nothing about the art of writing, whereas writing was very much in vogue among the natives of Mohenjodaro and Harappa. Even if this were true, the conclusion drawn by the Professor would not have inevitably followed, because a less civilized people coming to an area where a more civilized people dwelt before them, might still not be able for long to show any signs of assimilating the culture of the older inhabitants of the land. Many parallels can be cited from history of such happenings in India and elsewhere.[2] But it is not true that the *Ṛgveda-*

---

[1] *Gaṅgā*, Purātattvāṅk, January 1933, pp. 68-9, *Divākar*, Vedāṅk, October 1935, pp. 120-1. and a full paper on the subject under the title "The Bearing of Mohenjodaro on the date of the Ṛgveda", read before the Eighth All-India Oriental Conference, held at Mysore in December 1935.

[2] The present-day natives of Easter Island in Polynesia cannot make out anything of the old tablets with strange symbols that are found in the island. It has been held by scholars that those tablets and a large number of peculiar statues found in that island are vestiges of an older civilization. Henri Lavachery has denied in *Antiquity* 1936, pp. 54-60, that that civilization belonged to a different people. He supposes that the old techniques are lost through the death of the old "experts". It is doubtful if such wholesale loss of tradition is possible. In any case, we have here clearly an instance of ignorance of writing

*saṁhitā*[3] shows no knowledge of writing, though that is often assumed.

Hymn 71 of the Tenth Maṇḍala of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* is in praise of the Sacrificial Speech, the sacred *mantra*. Verse 4 of the hymn

उत त्वः पश्यन्न ददर्श वाचमुत त्वः शृण्वन्न शृणोत्येनाम् ।
उतो त्वस्मै तन्वं१ विसस्रे जायेव पत्य उशतीः सुवासाः ॥

("And some seeing Speech sees her not, and some hearing hears her not, whereas to another, she abandons herself like a wife with longing in her heart and decked in goodly dress,") clearly distinguishes between speech that is heard and speech that is seen. Can "speech that is seen", distinguished from "speech that is heard", mean anything other than the written word? Certainly not. Consequently, the art of writing was very well known to the author of this hymn, as also to his hearers. It is true that this hymn is late. But there are late hymns in all the maṇḍalas of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, not in the Tenth Maṇḍala alone.[4] The lateness of this hymn does not alter the fact that

in an area where it was well known before. The Indo-European Greeks did not know of writing till the Phoenicians introduced it (*Herodotus* V. 58), though the Cretans long before used a linear script.

2. F. Max Muller, History of *Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (Reprint) pp. 262ff. M. Winternitz in his *History of Indian Literature* Vol. I (English translation). p. 32, says "In the whole of Vedic literature it has not, up till now, been possible to find any proofs of an acquaintance with the art of writing, and its extensive use at that time." M. Bloomfield supposed that *Atharvaveda-saṁhitā* XIX. 72 shows the use of manuscripts of the Vedas (*Vedic Concordance*, Preface, viii) but वेदम् (line *a*) there means the Vedic *mantra* used in the sacrifice (इष्टम् of line *c*) the same as ब्रह्मणः (line *c*), and a *book*, and कोशात् (line *a*) refer not to a box for keeping manuscripts in but means the source of speech, the *dvyacas* and *vyacas* of XIX. 68.
4. See E.V. Arnold *Vedic Metre*, S.K. Belvalkar, *Proceedings of the Second Oriental Conference*, pp. 11-34, etc. I have attacked the problem of determining early and late materials in the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā from a new point of view in a paper titled, "The Place of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* in the Chronology of Vedic Literature", read before the Eighth All-India Oriental Conference, held at Mysore.

it belongs to the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* as much as any other hymn. We cannot, therefore, say that this art was unknown in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*.

We have seen that in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* at least X. 71.4 shows a knowledge of writing. We can go a step further. It is known to scholars that there are six verses (and an odd line) in the text of the *Ṛgveda-soṁhitā*, as handed down to us, for which there are no corresponding *pada* forms in the *pada-pāṭha* of Śākalya. They must have found their way into the canon of the Śākala Śākhā after Śākalya. All the other verses of the *Ṛgveda-soṁhitā* (X. 71.4 among them) existed before Śākalya prepared *Pada-pāṭha* of this text. Now, there are indications to show that Śākalya wrote out his *Pada-pāṭha* of this text. The Prātiśākhya of the Śākala school, the Ṛkprātiśākhya ascribed to Śaunaka, treated the *Pada-pāṭha* as the *prakṛti* or the basis (II. 1, *sūtra* 105) from which the *Saṁhitā* text is to be reconstituted, though actually the *Saṁhitā* is the *prakṛti* and the *Pada* is as much of a *vikṛti* (modified text) as the *Krama* or the *Jaṭā* or the *Ghana*. The *Prātiśākhya* recounts each and every modification that is necessary to convert the *Pada-pāṭha* into the Saṁhitāpāṭha सर्वंशास्त्रार्थं प्रतिकण्ठमुक्तम्, (I. 23, *sūtra* 55). The accuracy of this method of reconstruction can be guaranteed only if the text taken as basic is fixed, unmodifiable. The *Saṁhitā* is liable to deviations through lapses in memory, but being the *ārṣī* (revealed) text it could not be reduced to writing, which would profane that sacred text. The *Padapāṭha* is an anārṣa (unrevealed or man-made) text (*Ṛkprātiśākhya* I. 24 etc.) and could be, therefore, written out. Being written out, it remained fixed and the application of the general rules and the individual specifications in the *Ṛkprātiśākhya* would convert into the *Saṁhitā* text without an iota of difference. The manner in which this Prātiśākhya quotes Śākalya and his followers shows that we must trace to Śākalya himself this manner of reconstructing the *Saṁhitā*. Consequently we have to trace to him as well a device for keeping the *Padapāṭha* directly fixed. This could be done only through writing it out. If it were not possible to reduce the *Pada* text to writing, an advantage that was certainly denied to the *ārṣī Saṁhitā* text, it could not have been treated as a *prakṛti* for the *Saṁhitā*. The raison d'etre of the *Padapāṭha*[5] is just making impossible any change in the sacred *Saṁhitā* text. This could have been made possible only by making the Pada text itself immutable. The Padapāṭha seems to have been thus a *written text* from the beginning. That the *Śrautins* committed to memory even this *Pada-pāṭha* (as also the *Krama* and more complex texts) is due to the esteem in which memory work has been held in India, which has led to the complete memorising of even secular texts in later times.[6]

Consequently by the time of Śākalya, who is earlier than the *Aitareyu Āraṇyaka*, the *Bṛhaddevatā*, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Nirukta*, which name him, and quite possibly came before the composition of some of those verses of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* which have no *pada* rendering in his *Pada-pāṭha*, the art of writing had come into use. *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* X. 71 4. which is earlier than Śākalya, as its analysis is given in his *Pada-pāṭha*, shows clear knowledge of writing. It is quite possible that writing had come into general use among the Aryans long before the composition of Ṛv. X. 71.4. Non-mention of the art of writing in other passages of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* may be due to pure accident, as is its mention itself in X. 71.4. Argumentum ex silentio by itself has no probative value. To take an example from a different field, there is no mention anywhere in the entire Vedic literature of riding horses in battle,[7] but it is impossible to believe that the cavalry was unknown to the Vedic Aryans, in view of the fact that fighting on horse-back was not only prevalent among the later Indo-Aryans and other Indo-Euro-

---

5. The common assumption that the *Pada* texts were invented to facilitate the *understanding* of the Saṁhitā texts is wrong. The purpose of the *Pada* text was the same as that of the *Krama*, the *Jaṭā*, *the Ghana* and the other *vikṛtis*, viz., keeping the *Saṁhitā* text unalterably fixed in memory by various devices. That the *Pada* text does give us some help in understanding the *Saṁhitā* is incidental and had nothing to do with the deliberate purpose of its author.

6. See Max Muller, op. cit., pp. 264-5, A.A. Macdonell, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 16.

7. Macdonell and Keith, Vedic Index, I. 42.

pean peoples of antiquity but can be traced to more primitive times (e.g. among the nomads of Central Asia in antiquity). In any case, ṚV. X. 71.4 clearly shows that it is not correct to say that the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* is wholly ignorant of the art of writing.

It may be asked, if writing was known in the period of the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā why was it that the Vedic texts were transmitted by word of mouth? Professor Lakshman Sarup urges this fact as a proof that writing was unknown. He supposes that the Vedas were called śruti i.e. 'hearing', because they would not be transmitted by any other means. We should remember that the name *śruti* for the Vedas is late. We do not find it earlier than *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* XXXII.8, a passage that belongs to the very late concluding portion of this Brāhmaṇa.[8] Not only the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* but all the other Vedic texts have been transmitted by word of mouth. Of these Vedic texts even the latest, in whose time writing had come into general use,[9] are equally called *śruti*. Consequently the term *śruti* can have nothing to do with ignoranc of writing. If it were so, *smṛti* texts would have been called *dṛṣṭi* or paṭhiti. In fact d*arśana*, a synonym for *dṛṣṭi*, is used in both the *Mīmāṁsā sūtras* for Veda. The significance of the term *śruti* is shown by a synonym for the Vedas in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (1.2),[10] *viz*., pratyakṣa[11].

---

[8] Chapters XXXI to XL of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* are late additions, later than the *Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa*. They come from the close of the Vedic period and the beginning of the Classical.

[9] For traces of the knowledge of writing in this period, see G.H. Ojha, *Bhāratīya Prācīna Lipimālā*, 2nd edition, pp. 9-13. Not all the arguments adduced by Pandit Ojha are acceptable, but some have considerable force. I may myself add that the use of the word *varṇa*= 'colour' for letters in these texts definitely points towards the use of writing.

[10] The *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* also names *Smṛti* and *Aitihya* (=Purāṇa) in the same passage, thus proving its own late date.

[11] Also in *Brahma-sūtra* III. 2.24 (23 according to Rāmānuja's text). The two Mīmāṁsā Sūtras also use, besides *darśana*, '(direct) sight', the name *śabda*, another synonym for *śruti*.

Vedas is a direct source of knowledge as Smṛti is mediate, its validity depending on its Vedic basis.[12] *śruti* or 'hearing' is only one variety of *pratyakṣa* or 'direct knowledge', but its special use for the Veda is due to the fact that the Vedas were *acquired* through hearing and no other manner of *acquiring* them was permitted even in modern times. This is the only manner of acquiring the Vedas among the orthodox *śrautins*. The Vedas were transmitted by word of mouth, not because writing was unknown, but because in that way alone could their correct intona be faithfully maintained. Slightest changes in sound or even accent would destroy the efficacy of the *mantras*.[13] An equally important reason for the verbal transmission of the Vedas was that they are too sacred for writing.[14] A written text would be profane matter. No body would ever believe that the art of writing was unknown to the author of the Pāṇinīya-Śikṣā, who uses the word *varṇa* (literally'colour') for letters of the alphabet (verse3) , but he includes (v.32) the likhitapāṭhaka ('one who reads the Vedas from written texts,) among *Pāṭhakādhamāḥ* ('vile Vaidikas'). The Vedic mantras were believed to be efficacious only when transmitted by word of mouth (*anuvacana*) . Students of the Tantras will recall the special efforts that have been made for hiding the full form of the specially sacred *mantras*. To use an expression of Anthropology, the *mana* of the Vedic *mantras* would be destroyed by written transmission.[15]

---

[12] The term *smṛti* has been invented to show just this; smṛti or memory depends on *śruti* or sound (or any other kind of direct perception, *pratyakṣa*). Velid *smṛtis* are all believed to have a Vedic basis; where no corresponding *śruti* texts are at present forthcoming, their existence is still inferred from these smṛti texts. Hence Smṛtis are also called in the *Brahma-sūtra* III. 2.24 and III. 3.31 (III. 2.23 and III. 2.32 acc. to Rāmānuja) anumāna, 'inference', corresponding to *pratyakṣa*, 'direct Knowledge', used for the Vedas.

[13] Cf. *Pāṇinīya*-Śikṣā, verse 52.

[14] I have hinted this above when discussing the origin of the *Padapāṭha*.

[15] Cf. also Macdonell, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 16, showing that neither the practice of memorising texts, nor the non-reference to writing in India, has any bearing on knowledge or ignorance of the art of writing.

Dr. Lakshman Sarup's argument, therefore, based on the assumption that writing was unknown in the period of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, fails to prove its priority to the Mohenjodaro civilization. What bearing the knowledge of writing shown by ṚV. X.71.4 and the *Pada-Pāṭha* of Śākalya has on the genetic and chronological relations between Vedic civilization and the Indus valley culture cannot be indicated without going into the whole question at considerable length. I must postpone that discussion till after the publication of Dr. Lakshman Sarup's views in an adequate form, when it will be possible for me to discuss his other arguments also. My present purpose is simply to show that writing was known to the Aryans, at least in the latter half of the vast period of time represented by the hymns of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*.[16]

The following statement of Julius Caesar about the Druids, who were Celtic priests, very much resembling the Brāhmaṇas of ancient India, will prove of interest in connexion with the problem of the knowledge of writing among the trasmitters of the Vedic lore:—

"They (apprentices sent to the Druids for learning the priestly profession) are said there (i.e. in the houses of their Druid teachers) to learn by heart a great number of verses; accordingly some remain in the course of training twenty years. Nor do they regard it lawful to commit these to writing, though in almost all other matters, in their public and private transactions, they use Greek characters. That practice they seem to me to have adopted for two reasons; because they neither desire their doctrines to be divulged among the mass of the people, nor those who learn to devote themselves the less to the efforts of memory, relying on waiting; since it generally occurs to most men, that in their dependence on writing they relax their diligence in learning thoroughly and their employment of the memory." *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*, VI. 13, translated by W.A. Mcdevittee).

---

[16] I have tried to show in the paper read before the last Oriental Conference held at Mysore, referred to above, that the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* contains compositions of all periods, from the earliest to the latest Vedic texts. The common view that the other Vedic texts were composed after the canon of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* was closed is a mere assumption and has no basis in fact. Its latest hymns belong to the same period as saw the composition of some of the Upaniṣads, though of course, its earliest hymns are certainly earlier than any other Vedic or, for the matter of that, Indo-European texts. Consequently the period of time represented by the hymns of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* would mean the entire Vedic period.

See also J.A. MacCulloch in Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol.V,P.85.

## III. 5

# KĪKAṬA IN ṚKSAMHITĀ ITS IDENTIFICATION AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE

कीकटेभ्यो य आच्छिद्य गाः सुदासे प्रदत्तवान् ।
तमिन्द्रं मनसा ध्यात्वा विमर्शं कञ्चिदारभे ॥
देशस्तेषां कुरुक्षेत्रं बहुन्यग्रोधपादपम् ।
आर्याणामितरेषां च यत्राभूत् संगरो महान् ॥
भवेयुर्बृहतः स्तूपास्तद्देशे ये पुरातनाः ।
लभ्येरन् खननात्तेषां चिह्नानि संगमस्य वै ॥
इत्याशावान् द्विजन्माहं क्षेत्रेशचन्द्रकाश्यपः ।
अधिकारिजनान् याचे खननं क्रियतामिति ॥
ऊर्णरश्चाङ्गलो विद्वान् इति यातो दिवं प्रति ।
आकल्पान्तं वसेत् स्वर्गे प्रार्थयेऽहं प्रयागतः ॥

It is well known to scholars that the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* (III.-53. 14) makes reference to the land of the Kīkaṭas. Kīkaṭa, in later literature meant the country of Magadha;[1] and several modern scholars have assumed, without examination, that identification for RV. III. 53.14,[2] though the context of the passage gives a wholly different indication.

The passage belongs to the Viśvāmitra *maṇḍala* of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*. Hymns 33 and 53 of this *maṇḍala* show Viśvā-

---

1. *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* II. 11, *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* IV. 26, *Śrīmad Bhāgavata* I. 3.24.
2. E.G. Nundolāl Dey, *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India*, 2nd ed., p. 100, H. Zimmer in *Altindisches Leben*, p. 31, A. Weber in *Indische Studien*, I, 186, H.C. Raychaudhuri in *Calcutta Review*, Oct. 1924, p. 76. But H. Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 410, A. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, II, 236, Macdonell and Keith *Vedic Index*, I, 159 and J. Charpentier, J.R.A.S., 1930, p. 336 have expressed doubts about this identification.

mitra's solicitations for the Bharatas and their king Sudās. The former describes how Viśvāmitra safely carried Sudās and his people across the Beās and the Sutlej. The object of the march seems, ostensibly to have been the conquest of new land, or as the text actually puts it, the acquisition of cattle.[3] The leader of the expedition, the priest Viśvāmitra, seems to have had an additional purpose of his own. From hymn 18 of the Seventh Maṇḍala of *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* and other texts we know that Sudās was attacked by a league of ten kings, which was, foiled. This famous battle was fought on the banks of the Rāvi in the Panjāb. Vasiṣṭha was at that time the priest of Sudās. From traditions in Vedic and later literature it seems that the king changed over to a different priest, Viśvāmitra, some time after this.[4] This would naturally make the Vasiṣṭha inimical to Viśvāmitra and we have a tradition, clearly supported by ṚV. III, 53 15-16 that a Vasiṣṭha used magic against Viśvāmitra which seems to have been of the nature of "voice catching."[5] It is only through the help of Jamadagni that Viśvāmitra could recover from the bad effect of Vasiṣṭha's charm. In *ṚV*. III. 53.21-23, Viśvāmitra abuses his enemy, seemingly Vasiṣṭha, to his heart's content. Vasiṣṭha, however, in *ṚV*. VII, 104. 15-16, denies having ever used magic and returns his rival's abuse with full interest. We have thus textual confirmation of the animosity between Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha over the priestly office of king Sudās. After his unfortunate experience, Viśvāmitra would naturally remain in secret dread of the real or supposed magical powers of Vasiṣṭha and must have sought to avoid them in future. Sudās also on his part might be afraid of, or have been frightened into apprehending, another league of kings against him. Thus Viśvāmitra could easily induce the king to leave the Punjāb and look for some other land, where he could settle in peace.

---

[3] The Bharatas are described as "seekers of cattle" (*gavyangrámaḥ* in V. 11 and *gavyávaḥ* in V. 12).

[4] See my paper "The Dāśarājña Battle" in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, VI, pp. 261-264, now re-appearing in Vol. I. of this book.

[5] For instances of "voice catching" see Max Freedom Long's *Recovering the Ancient Magic*, pp. 231-232.

Hymn 34 of the Third Maṇḍala of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* contains a dialogue between Viśvāmitra and the rivers Vipāś (Beās) and Śutudrī (Sutlej), which they want to cross. The sage requests the rivers to stop their course (rámadhvam, v. 5), to bend low (nīnamadhvam, v. 9), so that the Bharatas may safely load them with their carts and chariots. The rivers agree (vv. 8 and 10) but stipulate that the bard will commemorate their kind service in measured numbers (v. 8). The host safely crosses the rivers and Viśvāmitra tells them that they can now swell again and resume their old course (v. 12). It is to be noted that the river Vipāś is named first in verse 1 and alone in verse 3, clearly indicating that this river was encountered by the traveller before they came to the Śutudrī. Consequently Viśvāmitra and the Bharatas must have been coming from the direction of the central Panjāb and moving in a south-easterly or southern direction.

Hymn 53 also seems to refer to the same incident. This hymn can be divided into two portions, verses 1-8 (or 1-7) forming an introduction praising Indra (or a separate hymn altogether, mixed up through a confusion in tradition with the following hymn), and verses 9.24 (or 1-24), a regular historical hymn, showing how Indra helped Sudas at the intercession of Viśvāmitra.[6] This historical portion begins with the statement that the great sage stopped the river (*ástabhnāt sindhum*), that Indra showed his grace, when Viśvāmitra carried (*ávahat*) Sudās across. Though the name of the river is not actually given here, the parallelism with hymn 33 makes it quite clear that the same crossing of the Beās (and the Sutlej) is meant. Viśvāmitras are enjoined to go forward and to release the horses of Sudās for the winning of wealth (I. 11). Shortly after this comes verse 14

---

6. Three verses about the end (21-23) contain invectives against some unnamed rivals, seemingly the Vasiṣṭhas, who were responsible for making Viśvāmitra leave his home. These verses are known to tradition as anti-Vasiṣṭha (*Bṛhad-devatā* IV, 117). Viśvāmitra refers to the black magic used against him by his rival and his own recovery from its effect in verses 15 and 16.

in which the poet says to Indra, "what purpose of thine is served by the cows in the land of the Kīkaṭas ?. They neither milk them for the *āśīra*[7], nor heat the *gharmá*.[8] O bounteous one, bring to us the wealth of Pramaganda, subject to us the *Naicāśākhá*." It is clear from the verse that the individual Pramaganda and the place Naicāśākha have to be both assigned to the land of the Kīkaṭas.[9] The context also indicates that that land was reached shortly after Viśvāmitra crossed the Beās and the Sutlej with Sudās and the Bharatas (v. 9). Consequently we must look for the land in what was later known as Kurukṣetra, the land of the Bharatas in the age of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Great Epic*. The second half of verse 11 expresses the wish that Sudās may kill his enemy in the east, in the west, in the north and may then sacrifice in the best spot of the earth. Non-reference to the southern direction may indicate that the Bharatas reached in the course of their wanderings what was to them the southernmost point. In any case, "the best spot of the earth (*vára á pṛthivyāḥ*)" where Sudās is to sacrifice is very clearly the Kurukṣetra country. *ṚV*. III. 23.4 uses the same expression (*vára à pṛthivyàḥ*) for the banks of the Sarvasvatī and the Dṛṣadvatī where the sacrificial fire of the Bharatas is to shine bounteously. The *Brāhmaṇas*, it is well known, describe Kurukṣetra as the holiest of lands, where even the gods go to sacrifice.[10]

---

7. Some thing poured on the Soma juice, offered to Indra and other gods, to sweeten it. Milk was one of the objects so used.

8. Heated milk offered in the *Pravargya* ceremony.

9. Cf. K.F. Geldner, "Kīkaṭa would be the name of a land, Naicāśākha the name of the city and Pramaganda that of the king" *Der Rigveda* I, p. 355n.

10. *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā* II.1.4, IV 5.9. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* IV. 1.5.13, XIV. 1.1.2, *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* III. 126, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* XXXV. 4, etc. E.W. Hopkins after a short stay in India and a hurried tour through the land set in vogue the view that the Kurukṣetra region is the home of the Ṛgvedic culture (JAOS. Vol. 19, pt. 2, pp. 19-28). But we owe it to the greater familiarity with climatic conditions in the Panjāb of Dr. A.C. Woolner, whose death occurred just before the writing of this paper that this view was proved to be wrong (*Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, London, Vol. VI, pp. 541-554). It is only

That the land of the Kīkaṭas is Kurukṣetra is confirmed by the word *Naicāśākha* occurring in the passage. I have pointed out above that the language of *ṚV.* III. 53.14 forces on us the conclusion that Naicāśākha cannot be separated from the Kīkaṭa country. What is this Naicāśākha ? It must be either a portion of Kīkaṭa (say the chief city of the land) or Kīkaṭa itself. The name has a very interesting story to unfold. It it, as Yāska explains (*Nirukta* VI. 32), formed from *nīcā-śākha=nīcaīḥ—śākha* a Bahuvrīhi compound, meaning "having down-reaching branches." *Nīcā-śākha* must be the banyan tree, known in later texts as *nyag-rodha,* "growing downwards" which is well known for sending down shoots from its branches. That is how Jarl Charpentier understood the word[11]. A. Hillebrandt had also a faint glimpse of the true significance of the name[12], though he understood it to mean ultimately the Soma plant.[13] Now, we find the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* XXXV. 4 (VII. 30) actually mentioning that the nyagrodhas of Kurukṣetra were the first born of the species, from which sprang the other nyagrodhas.[14] This clearly indicates that it is first of all in Kurukṣetra that the Aryans came across this wonderful plant and from here they carried it elsewhere. *Naicāśākha* of our passage would, therefore, mean

---

in the later Vedic period, when the sacrificial ritual had attained a good deal of complexity, that the chief centre of Brahmanical culture was in Kurukṣetra country. The earlier hymns of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* seem to have been composed, when the Aryans were still confined to the Panjāb.

[11] *JRAS*, 1930.

[12] *Vedische Mythologie* 1, p. 247.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 204-7.

[14] "यतो वा अधि देवा यज्ञेनेष्ट्वा स्वर्गं लोकमायंस्तत्रैतांश्चमसान् न्युब्जंस्तो न्यग्रोधा अभवन्, न्युब्जा इति हाप्येनान् एतर्ह्याचक्षते कुरुक्षेत्रे, ते ह प्रथमजा न्यग्रोधानां तेभ्यो हान्येऽधिजाताः ॥"

"Sacrificing in what place the gods went to heaven, there they overturned (*nyubjan*) the drinking bowls; these became *nyagrodhas*, which are even now called *nyubja* in Kurukṣetra. They are the first-born of *nyagrodhas*, the others are born from them."

"the land abounding in (or well known for) *nīcā-śākha*,[15] i. e. the banyan tree", which as the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* shows, Kurukṣetra certainly was. Consequently, we cannot have any hesitation in locating the Kīkaṭa country in the Kurukṣetra region.

We may now ask ourselves why then Kīkaṭa was later identified with Magadha ? H. Oldenberg supposes that the mistake is due to seeking a clue from the name of king Pramaganda, mentioned in the same passage.[16] But I fear that this is not the correct explanation. Yāska in this comments on this passage in the *Nirukta* (VI. 32) explains Kīkaṭa as the land of the *anāryas* (*Kīkaṭo nāma deśo' nāryanivāsaḥ*). That land of the *anārya*s was in Kurukṣetra when the Aryans first reached there, and as the Aryans penetrated further and further into Hindustān, the land of the *anāryas* receded farther and farther; Magadha and its adjoining provinces were for long taken as the home of the impure.[17] *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra* 1.1.2.13 ff. speaks of Aṅga, Magadha and some other provinces as outside the pale of Brahmanical culture, journey to which lands is forbidden.[18] Manu (II.24) wants members of the twice-born class to confine their dwelling to only Aryan territory. Consequently, later writers would very naturally take Magadha or Aṅga as *anārya-nivāsaḥ* and would, therefore, mistake of identifying it with Kīkaṭa, known from the *Nirukta* as the dwelling place of the *anāryas*.

---

[15] And not "a worshipper of the nīcāśākha" as supposed by Charpentier (JRAS, 1930, pp. 339ff.)

[16] *Ṛgveda, text kritische und exegetischo Noten*, I, p. 253.

[17] Cf. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* I.4.1.14-17, where the territory to-east of the river Sadānīrā the dividing line between Kosala and Videha, is described as formerly not inhabited by Brāhmaṇas.

[18] Cf. the well known verse :

"अङ्गवङ्गकलिङ्गेषु सौराष्ट्रमगधेषु च । तीर्थयात्रां विना गच्छन् पुनः संस्कारमर्हति ॥"

according to which a member of the twice-born class going to these lands except on pilgrimage has to undergo purification.

Whatever may be the basis for the later identification of Kīkaṭa with Magadha or Aṅga it is abundantly clear that *Kīkaṭeṣu* in *ṚV.* III. 53.14 means Kurukṣetra. THIS PASSAGE SUPPLIES US WITH THE FIRST CLEAR REFERENCE TO THE CONTACT OF EXPANDING ARYANS WITH THE NON-ARYANS. Sudās and his Bharatas here attacked Pramaganda and his people, who knew nothing of the Vedic sacrificial cult, and dispossessed them of their cattle wealth. The Bharatas then settled here and made the region their permanent home. It is significant that two Bharata princes Devaśravas and Devavāta are placed on the banks of the Sarasvatī and the Dṛṣadvatī in *ṚV.* III. 23. Other Aryan tribes came in the wake of the Bharatas and formed another settlement close by, the country of the Pañcālas. Kīkaṭa=Kurukṣetra which was before Sudās a land where no Vedic sacrifice was known, later became the great centre of Vedic sacrifices and Aryan civilization.

Vestiges have lately been discovered here of pre-Aryan civilization. At Kotla Nihang Khan in Dt. Ambālā, about a mile to the east of Rūpar (on the Sutlej) and some 30 to 40 miles to the north west of the present Kurukṣetra, the archaeological department has found[19] prehistoric mounds containing objects connected with things found at Harappā, Mohenjo-dāro and other places of pre-Aryan[20] culture. It is quite possible that here or close by lived the ancient Kīkaṭas with whom the old Bharatas first came in contact. If so, a close study of these ancient remains is likely to lead to the discovery of signs of Aryan and non-Aryan contact. Such discoveries would help in the dating of the Vedic culture and in solving a large number of problems in ancient Indian history. May we, therefore, suggest to the Archaeological Department of the Government of India that EXTENSIVE AND INTENSIVE EXCAVATIONS BE IMMEDIATELY TAKEN IN HAND BY THE DEPARTMENT

---

[19] *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, 1829-30, pp. 131-2.

[20] That the civilization of Indus basin is non-Aryan and pre-Aryan is very clear from the remains; see Sir John Marshall in *Mohenjo-Dāro and the Indus Civilization*, Vol. I, pp. 107-112.

IN THE WHOLE REGION BETWEEN THE JUMNĀ AND THE SUTLEJ ?[21] Even if excavations in this tract do not reveal proofs of the first contacts of the Aryans with the non-Aryans, they may be confidently expected to throw some light on the heroes of the Great Epic.

---

[21] Since writing the above, I have learnt with great pleasure that the Department has begun excavation in this area.

# SECTION IV

# INDO-IRANIAN STUDIES

।। ओ३म् नमः शिवाय ।।

नटराजं नमस्कृत्य चिदम्बरविलासिनम् ।
उमया परितो व्याप्तं तथापि सङ्गवर्जितम् ।।१।।

जगज्जन्मादिहेतुं तं सर्वेषां परमं गुरुम् ।
एषणानां परं लक्ष्यम् आत्मतत्त्वम् अविप्लवम् ।।२।।

परस्तान्मनसो वाचो भूयोऽपि श्रुतिगोचरम् ।
वेदविज्जनभक्तोऽहं वेदगोष्ठीं समारभे ।।३।।

राधाकृष्णादयः सर्वे विबुधाः समुपागताः ।
शृण्वन्तु प्रक्रमं चैतं प्रेमप्रश्रयमानसाः ।।४।।

सङ्गतिं प्रापतुर्यत्र सितासिते सरिद्वरे ।
तत्रस्थः काश्यपो विप्रः प्रार्थयेऽहं कृताञ्जलिः ।।५।।

## IV. 1

# VEDIC STUDIES : NEW DIRECTIONS IN THE LIGHT OF INDO-IRANIAN MATERIAL

We are deeply obliged to western orientalists for teaching us how to study our own texts historically. But they have not always been able to get at the true significance of our culture for lack of understanding of the actual psychological reactions to religious situations. India is a vast museum of human culture at all levels. Our great advantage is that we can study all these levels of thought through the pulsations of actual life. It is thus from a commingling of the two streams of study, the western and the eastern that there can flow a rich store of knowledge which will benefit entire humanity.

In my previous presidential address I had passed in review the researches of a number of fellow workers in the field of Vedic Studies. Instead of following the same method, I shall this time place before you some of my own ideas, which, I hope, will prove of interest to my fellow-workers. In doing this I shall attempt, as a resident of Prayāga where two streams one fair and the other dark, commingle in holy union to make a combination of western and eastern thoughts.

Vedic studies have been hampered by several wrong assumptions which have not given us correct perspective in a number of points. After the first clear understanding of the relationship between different Indo-European languages, western scholars began positing a date like the fifteenth century before Christ for the dispersal of different tribes from the original home of the Indo-Europeans. The beginnings of the Vedic texts could not, therefore, be placed earlier than 1,000 or at the utmost 1,200 years before Christ. This view was strengthened by certain wrong assumptions of Max Muller which were also wrongly understood by later European writers. Even though this *andha-paramparā* was resisted by Winternitz as early as 1905, the old views were repeated by others in later publications. We have now better knowledge of western pre-history and the ancient history of the east. Still the old views about the beginnings of Vedic literature persist as standard views among western and many Indian scholars. The results of the labours of different western and eastern scholars tend to my mind to point towards a date like ±2500 B.C. to ±500 B.C. for the whole of the Vedic literature. It is only within such wide limits of time that developments in Vedic religious thought and practices can be properly understood.

The earliest texts give indications of real devotion to the gods, with very simple rituals accompanying the spontaneous prayers addressed to them. In course of time, the rituals grew in complexity and in rigidity and the gods in whose honour the rites were originally performed got dethroned and were made subservient to the sacrifices which they also have been described as performing. The older historians taught us that civilization started with the Aryans in this land. The discovery and the study of the prehistoric non-Aryan civilisation of the Indus basin have given a different bend altogether to our studies. We now understand that some of the pre-Aryan peoples of India were more highly civilized, from both material and spiritual points of view, than the Aryan invaders. The first contact between the non-Aryans and the physically stronger Aryans rushing down on the dwellers of the soil on the back of their fleet-footed horses and wielding tremendous battle-axes, must have been of the nature of *veni, vidi, vici,* on the side of the Aryans and *jaṅghābalam* or *adarśanaṁ lopaḥ* on the side of the non-Aryans. It was probably after the Bharatas led by Viśvāmitra crossed the Beas and the Sutlej and settled down in Kurukṣetra (then called Kīkaṭa) or when they migrated still further east, that any real contact between the Aryans and the non-Aryans could take place. As has happened elsewhere, the conquerors were led by captives and the Aryans learnt from the dwellers of this holy soil lessons in austerities (tapas) and the practice of *yoga*, the two most important spiritual practices mentioned in late Vedic texts and in all later Indian Literature. It is in just such a context that the rise of the Upaniṣads can be understood. Though man dethroned gods earlier and substituted them by his own speech or handiwork, he could now elevate himself to real godhood through self-reflection and meditation. The Aryan love for Truth and non-Aryan method of self-realization combined to bring about those sublime thoughts that have raised the status of man higher than it was ever before.

Connected with the question of Vedic chronology is the problem of the relation between the Vedas and the Avesta. The linguistic agreements in religious ideas have made western scholars place them in the same period of time. This has affected the proper understanding of a number of Vedic ideas. Recent researches have shown that the date of birth of Zarathustra, the founder of the Avestan religion, was somewhere near 631 B.C., which is the real traditional date. The linguistic agreements between the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, *Gāthās* of *Zarathustra* and the other texts in the Gāthā dialect in the *Avesta* have been used as arguments for a late date of the Vedas and an early date of the Avesta, in utter disregard of the *anyonyāśraya* (argument in a cycle) involved in this. If there are several points of agreement between the Vedas and the Avesta in matters of language, there are several others between the Avesta and Classical Sanskrit and even Prakrits and still greater agreement between the language of the Avesta and the Ancient Persian of the Achaemenian inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ. We find the present day Lithuanian language showing strong points of agreement with ancient Sanskrit. It also preserves the old pitch accent of the Vedas. But no body can place Lithuanian and Sanskrit in the same period of time. *Linguistic arguments are of value only when comparisons are made between different languages belonging to the same geographical area.* History has shown that certain languages have had a rapid development, while others have been static or practically static for a long time. Historical arguments to push the date of Zarathustra beyond the seventh century B.C. have brought in several self-contradictions which have not appeared so to their authors. Though the date of the Avesta is very much later than the beginnings of the Vedic literature, the Avesta and even the account of the religion of the Persians preserved by Herodotus show that religious ideas of the Aryan times were preserved on the Iranian soil with very little alteration for a long time.

One of our usual wrong assumptions is the view that the whole of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* is earlier than the remaining Vedic literature. But can such a view be correct ? Several attempts have been made for the chronological stratification of the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā*. They may have been individually unsuccessful but their collective effect is to prove that this *Saṁhitā* contains very ancient and very late materials. The *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* is in the language of E.V. Arnold, "not a book, but a library and a literature." We have to bear in mind the fact that six verses have found their way into the canon of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* after Sākalya compiled its *padopāṭha*. Besides these six verses, there are many verses and hymns which bear on their faces the stamp of a late date. There are the *Āprī-Sūktas*, giving praises in due order of the devatās of the *prayājas* in the Paśu sacrifice according to the rigid order of the fully developed ritual. There are also materials for the Prauga-śastra, again following a fixed order. We have in a few places the word *āsura* or its derivative *asura* used in the later sense of 'demon'. Such late materials are interspersed throughout the text, even in the supposedly early "family books."

Are these "family books" necessarily early ? If we can look over the well-known arrangement of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, it ought to be evident to us that they are not. The "family books" certainly form the nucleus of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*. The first Maṇḍala is also a family Maṇḍala, its only difference being that it contains a number of small collections instead of only one. These family collections seem to have been originally arranged in the order of the number of hymns comprised in them, the shorter collections coming first and the longer ones coming afterwards. It is well-known that in the Devatāwise sub-sections the longer hymns come first and the shorter ones afterwards. But this scheme has been disturbed at a number of places in a manner which shows that additions have been made from time to time but without disturbing the original collections. These facts show that at a time when the spring of hymn-making was drying up, the necessity was felt for collecting the old hymnal lore for utilisation in different sacrifices. Hymns in different metres were needed for different purposes and the vast number of *Kāmya* sacrifices listed in the Yajurveda texts needed different verses for *puranuvākyā* and *Yājya* purposes and for *śastras* in a large variety of sacrifices. Collections must have been sent to different *ṛṣi* families for securing the previovs family heirlooms and as and when other members of those families were contacted who had other hymns to yield to these gatherers of precious hymnal lore, the newest crops were also harvested but kept slightly apart from the old ones. The later gatherings were not necessarily later compositions. But it is inevitable in such a process of collection that old and late materials should jostle together: The Yajurveda *mantras* were from the beginning arranged in a particular order according to the strict needs of the ritual. Though such an order is, in the very nature of the case, impossible about the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*, they too seem to have been gathered together for purposes of ritualistic use. It is not impossible that as *collections*, the Yajurvedic mantras were put together before the collection of the hymnal lore of the Ṛgveda started. That is why the family books of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* begin with the Agni hymns and not with those in praise of the more popular deity, Indra. This will explain the occasional differences in reading between certain verses as found in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* and as found in the Yajurveda and the Sāmaveda texts : floating materials must have been widely utilised before they were rigidly codified.

We are thus forced to accept the position that the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* as a whole is not to be separated from the *mantra* portion of the Yajurveda and the Sāma veda, though many of its hymns are much earlier than the *mantra* portions of the Yajurveda and the Samaveda, though many of its hymns are much earlier than the *mantras* of the other Vedas, in fact earlier than any other Indo-European texts. This view will enable us to understand quite a number of difficult *ṚK-saṁhitā* passages in the light of rituals.

After these preliminaries of historical, linguistic and textual analyses, let us turn to some problems of the history of Vedic religion. Religion is *recognition of higher existence with striving for its realisation.* Among higher existences gods have always occupied an important position. Though we may not agree with Andrew Lang and Pater Schmidt in believing that primitive religions show monotheistic tendencies, the idea of a great god, a god higher than other gods, has always been before the human mind. Such a god is certainly the one corresponding to Dyauspitṛ, Zeus Pater, Jupiter and Tyr among the primitive Indo-Europeans. These people must definitely have believed in and worshipped a number of other deities. Not all of them were forces of nature. The researches of H. Usener, accepted by Otto Schrader, show that the different Indo-European peoples and quite likely the undivided Indo-Europeans believed in "departmental gods", presiding over different departments of life or human activities. The same state of affairs persisted in Indo-Iranian time and passed on to the Indo-Aryan period.

Though, the Highest God, Father of all, peeps in some time and benignly smiles at us through the hymns of the Ṛgveda, he does not seem to have come in for much of a worship in the earlier period. It is other gods, who were believed to serve human purpose, that received worship at the hands of the ancient Aryans. Among these gods, Indra was the most important. Whatever may be the common notion about his character in the Vedic age, he seems to have been originally not a god of rains and thunder. There were other gods, Rudra, the Maruts, Apām Napat, Trita Āptya etc. for these phenomena. A number of passages in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* about Vṛtrahan Indra, read with the description of Varathragna in the Avesta, of Vahran in an old Armerian mythological poem, of Indra in Hitite texts and Andresta in a Celtic reference in Dio Cassius's history of the Romans, show that Indra was originally a god of strength and war. As god of strength and war, he naturally became the demon-killer or dragons-layer *par excellence.* The imageries that grow up round the phenomena of rain and thunder took the form of war on a vast scale. It is natural, therefore, that the great god of strength and war should in course of time occupy the most central figure in this warfare. Without being originally a god of rain and thunder Indra came to usurp the functions of such a god: We have a good parallel in Greek Mythology. Poseidon was originally the god of thunder in Greece. But the sky god, Zeus became the thunderer and pushed Poseidon to the character of a god of the sea. Indra as god of strength and war was a departmental god, with special appeal to fighters and their leaders, the Kings. It is for this reason that most of the *dānastuti* verses occur at the end of Indra hymns. Even as god of rains and thunder, he was a departmental god with appeal to a larger section of the community.

With the Aryans settling down in the country and having lesser need for war with the original dwellers or among themselves attention of the people was drawn more and more to deeper things of life. Now was the time for the importance of the Ādityas. The Ādityas were mostly solar deities presiding over different aspects of the Sun. Viṣṇu was definitely a Sun god, representing the dynamic aspect of the Sun. The four objects held by his four arms in his later iconic representations śaṅkha, chakra, gadā and padma are all solar emblems. Mitra is clearly the rising Sun. There has been difficulty in understanding the character of Varuṇa who has been closely associated with Mitra and who was the most important of the Ādityas. In later times he became the god of waters and of the western directions. The unfortunate equation of the name *Varuṇa* with Greek *ouranos*, meaning 'sky' gave European scholars a wrong lead. They supposed that he was the god of sky, though it was admitted that there was no Vedic textual warrant for such a view and though there is very little evidence in Greek literature to show that Ouranos was used as the name of the sky god. In my presidential address at Trivandrum I had assailed the equation Varuṇa—Ouranos on phonetic grounds. *Varuṇa* appears to be a purely Indo-Aryan word, formed, in the same way as *Karuṇa*, *taruṇa*, *dharuṇa* etc. Oldenberg, under the spell of his theory that the Ādityas were planets, looked upon Varuṇa as the Moon. In forming this opinion he was helped by Ṛksaṁhitā texts connecting the activities of Varuṇa with night. That makes his constant association with Mitra difficult to understand. The most straight forward view that is warranted by all the facts known to us is that Varuṇa was the setting Sun or the night Sun as his associate, Mitra, was the rising Sun or the day Sun. These are the two different aspects of the self-same Sun. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa tells us that there are two sides of the solar orb, one bright and the other dark. In the day time Āditya keeps the bright side turned towards us. At sun-set he changes his side retraces his steps keeping the dark side turned towards us and the bright one on the side of the gods. Mitra and Varuṇa must have been the presiding deities (*abhimānins* in the language of the Brahma sūtra) of these sides, bright and dark. It is as the presiding deity of the supposedly dark Sun that he is the great watcher of human actions and the punisher of unrighteousness. It is at night or under the cover of darkness that sin prospers most. Both Mitra and Varuṇa look at our actions with unwinking eyes, evidently one by day and the other by night. It is because Varuṇa's activities start in the western direction that he was later associated with the west and with the sea and naturally, therefore, with waters. The Aryans acquired the knowledge of a sea in the west at a fairly early date. Roth was absolutely wrong when he said that the Varuṇa was already a declining god in what he supposed to be the Ṛgvedic period. In the developed Vedic rituals Varuṇa is a very important deity. Sacrifice has to be performed in his honour after finishing the Agniṣṭoma sacrifice and he is the *devatā* of many of the *prāyascitta* (expiatory) ceremonies.

Oldenberg and Bernard Geiger have seen in ten Ādityas the influence of the Babylonians. But why ? Their association with righteousness may make them good parallels of Śams, the Babylonian Sun-god but that does not warrant the hypothesis of either Babylonian influence on the conception of the Ādityas or of Indian influence on that of Śams. A hypothesis of diffusion of ideas can be seriously entertained only if two conditions are fulfilled, (1) the supposed creditor and debtor nations must be known to have been in contact, directly or indirectly and (2) the institution or the idea about which the hypothesis is going to be formed cannot be explained through ordinary human psychology or through the known history of the supposed debtors. Both these conditions must be fulfilled. In this case, there is nothing to show that in the early Vedic period there was any effective contact between the Aryans of India of the early Vedic period and the Babylonians, As sin prospers in darkness, a god of light which is the counter-entity of darkness is a god in eternal warfare with sin. The Ādityas are thus, according to universal human psychology, the punishers of sin and upholders of righteousness. This is how we find among the primitive hairy Ainus of Japan, the association between the Sun-god and righteousness. Surely, we cannot even dream of Babylonian influence on these Ainus.

In course of time, it is these solar deities that came to have a higher spiritual appeal to the Aryans than the god of war or of rains, Indra. If Varuṇa declined in importance in the post-Vedic period, so did Mitra, Pūṣan and several other solar deities. But Viṣṇu emerged as the great representative of all these gods and received the devotion of large section of the people. Indra's character deteriorated and he was a king of the gods more in name, than in reality, except perhaps in Buddhist references.

A reference may here be made to the other great deity who has shared with Viṣṇu the devotion of large masses of people in India, viz. Śiva. In shaping the character of this deity, several gods must have made important contributions. The original basis was certainly Rudra, the thunder-god of the early Vedic period. Thunder-gods have been represented in various countries by meteoric stones, supposed to be broken bits of thunder. These meteoric stones resemble phallic stones through which the creative aspect of God has been worshipped. It is probably an identification of the two *liṅgas* (signs), the meteoric stone and the phallic stone, that led to the identification of the two *liṅgins*, (persons signified). Thus Rudra, the destructive thunder-god became the destroyer in the later trinity and through his equation with the god of creation, he became the Īśāna or the Mahādeva. The destructive Rudra of the Veda had his manyu (ire), but he was still *mṛḍa* (merciful). The later Śiva was also *āśutoṣa* (easy to propitiate). The Indus basin people appear to have worshipped a contemplative god, who has been represented in a plaque as having three faces; it is possible that there were four faces of this deity, but the face at the back could not be represented in the plaque. That deity is seated in a yogic posture, surrounded by animals, and has two horns on his head. Rudra as a god of thunder became a god of fire. There are texts in the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*, showing an identification of fire on earth, lightning in the sky and the Sun still higher up. We have evidence of the god of fire as hearth-fire being the guardian of all beings round the hearth and particularly of the animals belonging to the household. Rudra is thus Paśupati, the lord of the domestic animals. An identification of that deity of the Indus basin, surrounded by animals, with Rudra Paśupati may have taken place, again through the identification of the *liṅgas*. The two horns probably are reduced to the sixteenth digit of the moon, कला च सा कान्तिमती कलावतः, Śiva bears on his head. If this identification did take place, that will explain how Śiva is a great Yogin, the great dispenser of salvation. It is through Death that one can pass into deathlessness. Standing under the shadows of Śiva Naṭarāja, I may conclude in the words of Kālidasa:—

प्रवर्ततां प्रकृतिहिताय पार्थिवः
सरस्वती श्रुतिमहती महीयताम् ।
ममापि च क्षपयतु नीललोहितः
पुनर्भवं परिगतशक्तिरात्मभूः ॥

॥ ओ३म् शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिरोम् ॥

## IV. 2

# THE LEGEND OF YIMA AND THE CRADLE OF THE ARYANS

Dr. Abinaschandra Das has replied in the February 1922 number of the Calcutta Review to Dr. Taraporewala's article in the December 1921 issue of the same journal on "The Legend of Yima." Dr. Das's main contention is that 'The Ṛgveda belongs to a period when the river Sarasvatī fell into the Western Sea passing through the modern Rajaputana desert. This is belied by a number of references in the Ṛgveda, as will be shown in this paper, which proposes to discuss the arguments of Das and Taraporewala with regard to the Legend of Yima. The reply consists practically of only two quotations from Dr. Das's own book, "Ṛgvedic India," and no other new matter is given. Every unbiased reader is constrained to feel that Dr. Das has not succeeded in refuting Dr. Taraporewala's arguments.

The original passage in the Avesta, where Ahura Mazdā advises Yima to build a *vara* (Vedidād, II. 25), has absolutely nothing which can make one conclude that the *vara* was to be built in a country different from that in which Yima lived. One would therefore naturally think that it was in Aryana Vaeja itself. Dr. Das could not suppose this as he had a preconceived notion in his mind. Not only that, he also contends that as Ahura Mazda described the nature of light in that region, Yima could not have been already acquainted with the place, hence the *vara* was in a different country. He has said in his "Ṛgvedic India" (Vol. I p. 550), "Yima, not knowing anything about the nature and physical conditions of this new country where he was advised to go, naturally asked Ahura Mazda about the lights, both created and uncreated, that were to be found there. To this query, the latter replied that in the Vara, the sun, the moon, and the stars 'rose but once a year' and that 'a year seemed only as 'a day' to the inhabitants thereof." But unfortunately, the query in the 39th verse of the Second Fargard of the Vendidād is by *Zarathustra* and not by Yima. Question, beginning *dātaregaethanam astvaitinam ashāum*, and the concluding *yo Yimo kerenaot* fully establish this. The 40th verse is thus in answer to the question of Zarathushtra. Dr. Abinashchandra Das should have noted that the Second Fargard of the Vedidad contained a dialogue between *Zarathushtra* and Ahura Mazda. The former asks "with which of the mortals didst thou first converse beside me ?" and the latter mentions Yima and relates his story. In the course of the story whenever Ahura Mazda says anything to Yima, he reports it to Zarathushtra as "I said", as in *āat he mraom Zarathushtra azem yo Ahuro Mazdāo*, i.e. "Then said I to him, O Zarathushtra, I, who am Ahura Mazda" (verse 4). But the expression in the 40th verse is *āat aogtha Ahuro Mazdāo*, i.e., "Then said Ahura Mazdā." Thus Dr. Das's contention that the *vara* was not in Airyana Vaeja is absolutely groundless. Dr. Das has brought forward some difficulties in supposing that the *vara* escaped the destructive flood which devastated the rest of the land. But these need not be seriously considered, for no sensible man would in these days believe that every particular in the legends of Yima's *vara* or Noah's Ark or Manu's Boat is true history. Dr. Das referred the reader to his book but has not answered the new arguments advanced by Dr. Taraporewala on the basis of Vendidād, I, 3-4, Yasht X, 104 and Vendidād, II, 19.

It will thus appear that Dr. Das's rejoinder has not been successful. I shall now try to show that the main thesis of his book "Ṛgvedic India" is as groundless. It appears to me that his thesis is based on what he understands to be the meaning of

*ekā-cetat sarasvatī nadīnam |*
*śuciryatī giribhya ā samudrāt ||*

(RV. VII. 95, 2).

He contends ("Ṛgvedic India," pp. 7ff) that as the Sarasvatī is thus said to flow into the sea, the seer must have lived in a geological epoch when *our Sarasvatī* emptied itself in the Rajaputana Sea (in the Tertiary epoch). But how does Dr. Das know that the Sarasvatī of this *mantra* is "our Sarasuti"? Any one who reads this passage with reference to its context will find it difficult to doubt that the Sarasvatī of this hymn is the Indus. It is a very dangerous thing to base arguments on stray passages dissociated from their context. I therefore quote in extenso the first two *mantras* :

*prá kṣodasā dhāyasā sasra eṣā́*
*Sarasvatī dharuṇam āyasī pūḥ*
*prabā́badhānā rathyeva yāti*
*viśvā apō mahinā́ sindhuranyā́ḥ* (1)

*ekā-cetat Sarasvatī nadīnām*
*śucir yatī giribhya ā samudrā́t*
*rāyaś cetantī bhuvanasya bhūrer*
*ghṛtam payo duduhe nāhuṣāya* (2)

The translation of the first *mantra* according to Sāyaṇa would be, "This Sarasvatī, a strong citadel of metal, runs with its sustaining waters ; and rushes on like a thoroughfare pushing on amain before her by her great power all the other rivers." *prabābadhānā* cannot mean "outstripping" as proposed by Dr. Das on p. 72 of his book. From this *mantra* it is evident that this Sarasvatī was a mighty river which received the waters of other tributary streams. This mighty river therefore must necessarily be the Indus. V.G. Bijāpūrkar in his edition of the Bombay University B.A. Selections from the Ṛgveda (*Ṛksaṅgraha*) has identified it with the Indus (p. 102). So also did the late Professor Dr. Hermann Oldenberg in his *Ṛgveda* (*textkritische und exegesische Noten*) (Vol. II, p. 63) on the authority of Hillebrandt. Macdonell in his *Vedic Mythology*, p. 87, writes, "There has been much controversy as to the identity of the stream of which the goddess Sarasvatī is a personification. The name is identical with that of the Avestan river Haraqaiti in Afghanistan and it may have been the latter river which was first lauded as the Sarasvatī. But Roth, Grassmann, Ludwig and Zimmer are of opinion, that in the Ṛgveda Sarasvatī usually and originally meant a mighty stream, probably the Indus (Sarasvatī being the sacred and Sindhu the secular name), but that it occasionally designates the small stream in the Madhyadeśa, to which both its name and sacred character were in later times transferred." This completely demolishes the theory of Dr. Das. In ṚV., VII. 95 I, *anyá viśvā apaḥ* can mean only the tributaries of the rivers and these are obviously the famous rivers of the Punjab. In confirmation of this identification I quote a *mantra* in the *Vājasaneya Saṁhitā* "seen' by Gṛtsamada the author of the major portion of the Second *Maṇḍala* of the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā*, which runs

> pañca nadyaḥ Śarasvatīm ápiyanti sasrotasaḥ /
> Sarasvatī tu pañcadhā so deśe bhavat sarit //
> (34, 11)

i.e. "Five rivers reach the Sarasvatī with their streams and the Sarasvatī has become a fivefold river in that land." All students of the *Nighaṇṭu* know that in the list of words meaning "rivers" (*Nigh.*, I, 12) *sarasvàtyaḥ* is one. Another word in the same list which would be interesting is *harasvatyaḥ* on account of its correspondence with the Avestic *haravaiti*. It is a pity Dr. Abinashchandra Das did not take the trouble of making himself thoroughly familiar with the *Nighaṇṭu* and the *Nirukta*. Had he done this, he would have been further saved from statements like "All the ancient Vedic commentators from Yāska, Śākapūṇī, Ourṇavābha (?) and Durgāchārya."(p. 350). "Ourṇavābha's commentary of the Ṛg-veda" and Durgāchārya's commentary of the Ṛg-Veda", given as bibliography on page 576, take one by surprise.

The only word in ṚV., VIII. 95. whose meaning is not beyond doubt is *rathyeva*. Sāyaṇa paraphrases, *pratolīva vistīrṇā satī*. *Pratoli* means a main road. The sense in this case would probably be "as lanes lead to the main road so do all streams flow into the Sarasvatī". Peterson in his *Second Selection of Hymns from the Ṛg Veda* (pp. 257-258) gives a different interpretation as proposed by Roth, taking *rathyā* to mean the car that travels along the road. Oldenberg in his *Ṛgveda*, cited above, refers to RV. III. 36.6 and to an article by himself in the Z.D.M.G. for a solution of its meaning. In III. 36.6 Sāyaṇa takes *rathyeva* to mean *rathinā iva* ; Grassmann in his *Worterbuch zum Ṛigveda* (column 1141, first line) takes it there as instrumental singular of *rathī* but he gives the word the same meaning (a charioteer) which Sāyaṇa has done. Sāyaṇa proposes in ṚV. VII. 95.1 an alternative interpretation of *rathinā iva*. Whichever may be the true meaning here, the question of the identification of the Sarasvatī is not altered in any way.

I have also failed to see what would have been really gained by Dr. Das if the Sarasvatī were "our Sarsuti". For, this latter river once did reach the sea through the Sutlej and the Indus. About this later Sarasvatī (Sarsuti) Macdonell writes, "According to Oldham a survey of ancient river-beds affords evidence that the Sarasvatī was originally a tributary of the Śutudrī (the modern Sutlej) and that when the latter left its old bed and joined the Vīpāś, the Sarasvatī continued to flow in the old bed of the Śutudrī." (*Vedic Mythology*, compare also Macdonell's History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 142. pp. 87-88). Dr. Das has not given us his authority for the statement in his book in page 7, lines 29-31. Thus the Rajputana Sea cannot in any case be the *samudra* into which the *Sarasvatī* of ṚV. VII. 95 flowed.

I have an additional ground for believing that the Sarasvatī of that hymn was none but the Indus and that is the reference to Sarasvān in *mantra*. The hymn consists of six *mantras* of which all but the third are addressed to Sarasvatī ; the *Anukramaṇikā* refers the third to Sarasvant. Who is this Sarasvān ? Sāyaṇa says he is madhyamasthāno vāyuḥ. But one fails to understand what would make the Seer refer (and that too in the middle) to the "Air of the Middle region" when addressing Sarasvatī. I propose to take it to mean the lower part of the Indus, the part from where the five rivers of the Punjab join her mouth. The third mantra is

sā vāvṛdhe nāryo yoṣaṇāsu
vṛṣā śiśur vṛṣabho yajñiyāsu /
sa vājinam maghavadbhyo dadhāti
vi sātaye tanvam māmṛjita // (3)

which can be translated as—"that beneficent (or brave) child became a potent bull (or Saturer) and increased when the sacrificial damsels (reached him). He gives *vājins* to the worshippers and 'chastens their body for their benefit'." The 'sacrificial damsels' are probably the five rivers whose waters are serviceable for sacrificial purposes. Sāyaṇa writes, *yajñīyāsu yajñārhāsu yoṣaṇāsu yoṣitsu ātmanaḥ kalatrabhūtāsu madhyamasthānāsu apsu madhye vavṛdhe vardhate.* So, my rendering 'the Punjab river' is not altogether impossible. *vājinam* I have left untranslated. Sāyaṇa paraphrases it by *balinam putram* (a brave son). Similarly, also Grassmann in his *Worterbuch* (1255). But may I suggest "a horse" ? The word *vājin* can mean a horse (cf. *Nigh.* I. 14 and Grassmann, 1254). We know that Sindh has always been famous for good horses. Thus the Sarasvant of the third *mantra* is probably the part of the Indus flowing through Sindh. The Indus has been known in later times as the *Sindhunada* (mas.). If 'Sarasvatī' can mean a *nadī*, 'Sarasvān' can mean a nada. We know that in the Punjab there is many a river whose one part is known by one name and the other by another, and that of these two names one is in the masculine gender and other in the feminine. I would refer my readers to Sir A. Stein's article in the *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume* on "River-names in the Rig-Veda." Thus the seer refers to the tributaries of the Indus in the first *mantra*, to its oceanic flight in the second and to its very broad course near its mouth in the third and there is no *prakrama-bhaṅga.*

Dr. Das has also cited some other Vedic passages in support of his theory. They too are unconvincing. I shall here comment on one of these passages. Dr. Das sees in ṚV. X. 136.6 a reference to the Eastern and the Western seas and he at once jumps to the conclusion that this proves the existence of the Rajputana Sea at the time (p. 10 of his book). But how that conclusion can be arrived at is more than one can understand. His Eastern Sea as given in his map is nothing but a portion of the Southern Sea.' "From the Eastern Sea to the Western" would then mean "along the Southern Sea" ! It is a very convenient arrangement to put down one part of the Southern boundary as South, another as East and a third as West (p. 12).

One only wonders that the Northern Sea too is not placed somewhere there. Further, is the learned Doctor aware that *samudra* in the ṚV. X. 136.6 as in most of the other passages cited in page 11, can mean "the sky" and not the "sea" and that in *Nighaṇṭu* (I, 3), *samudraḥ* is read as a synonym for 'sky?' Yāska, the commentator of the *Nighaṇṭu*, has a very lenghty note on the word (Nirukta, II, 10-11. 12). *Samudra* originally meant only a "great expanse of water," then in spite of the consternation of Dr. Das (*Rig-Vedic India*, p. 32) a rain-bearing cloud, and by extension of meaning the sky which looked like a great sheet of water and also contained those clouds and the word came to be exclusively used in the sense of the sea only at the last stage. *It is very dangerous to carry in one's mind the associations of late usage when reading old texts.* Besides, the sun rising from the Eastern Sea and going down in the Western cannot prove a contemporary Rajputana Sea, for it is only a man in mid-ocean that can thus see the sun rising up from and going down into the sea. A man on the coast would never see this and a man in an ocean boat *in any sea* (whether in Rajputana or south of Sindh, when the Rajputana Sea had dried up) would notice such a phenomenon.

Dr. Das has tried (p. 12) to make much capital out of the mention in the Ṛg-veda of "the Four Seas". In answer to this, one feels tempted to ask. "The *Purāṇas* and Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhavam* mention the four seas, are we therefore to put them in the Miocene or Pliocene Epoch ?" Many nations formerly conceived the Earth as surrounded on all sides by water. How is the Vedic mention of four seas on all the four sides different from that ?

It thus appears that the Vedic portion of Dr. Das's theory (which is from the point of view of the establishing of his thesis, the more important one) is very shaky. Not being a student of geology I could not form any estimate of the value of the geological authorities quoted in his Appendix (B) to Chapter VI that in the Miocene or Pliocene Age such very cultured people could live in the Punjab (or for that matter anywhere in the world) as the Vedic Aryans undoubtedly were. A rough basket or two of human workmanship of the Miocene or Pliocene Age does not necessarily prove the existence of civilised man. Dr. Das has said, "It is within the bounds of possibility that man appeared in India in the Miocene Epoch, though it is extremely doubtful that he attained the high degree of civilisation ascribed to him in the Ṛg-Veda, unless we assume that the evolution of man in India was earlier and more rapid than that of man in other parts of the Globe. The geographical distribution of land and water in India in the Miocene and Pliocene Epochs agrees to a very large extent with the description of land water in the Ṛg-Veda, which emboldens us to surmise that Pliocene man, at any rate, attained a comparatively high degree of civilisation in Sapta-Sindhu, as depicted in some of the earliest hymns of the Ṛg-Veda. It will surely be regarded as a very bold surmise, but we are forced to it by the irresistible evidence found in the Ṛg-Veda." (p. 114). But I have shown how "irresistible" some of this "evidence" is ; the other evidence I could not touch upon, as in doing so I would have to write a whole volume. To conclude, whatever may be the value of the geological facts marshalled by Dr. Abinaschandra Das, the Ṛgveda Saṁhitā refuses to fit in with them.

## IV. 3

# MARTIN HAUG'S THEORY OF INDO-IRANIAN RELIGIOUS SCHISM

भारतीं वेदविद्याया आवित्तस्य च मातरम् ।
नत्वाहमुभयोर्मध्ये सम्बन्धं दर्शये मुदा ॥
भारतीयजनानाञ्च पारसीकगणस्य च ।
अन्योन्यकलहाद्वृत्तं धर्मे सुमहदन्तरम् ॥
तन्मूलं वेद आवित्तेऽसुरादयर्थविवर्त्तनम् ।
इन्द्रादिश्रौतदेवानामावित्ते[1] दैत्यरूपता ॥
इति यद्धौग आचष्ट विद्याद्वयविशारदः ।
अमूलं तन्मतं कृत्स्नम् उपात्तं भूयसामपि ॥
वस्तुतस्तु द्वयोर्मध्ये सादृश्यं निबिडं किल ।
भेदांशः स्वल्पकश्चैव हेत्वन्तरप्रयोजितः ॥
कलहाद्धार्मिको भेद ईदृशः कुत्र दृश्यते ।
दृष्टान्तलवशून्यं तत् त्यज्यतां विबुधैर्मतम् ॥

"Paying obeisance to Bhāratī, the Mother of both the Veda and the Avestā, I show with joy the relation between the two. The view expressed by Haug, scholar of both the lores that a religious schism was caused between the Indians and the Iranians through mutual quarrel, which led to the inversions in meaning of the terms 'asura' and 'deva' and converted Indra and other Vedic gods into demons in the Avestā, is an altogether baseless theory, though accepted by many. In actual fact, however, the agreements between the two scriptures are very close and the differences are small, easily explainable through other causes. Where has such a religious change due to quarrel been ever seen ? Scholars should abandon this theory unsupported by the slightest parrallel."

---

[1] I take *āvitta* or *āvittaka* (="obtained", *i.e.*, "revealed") as the phonetic equivalent in Sanskrit of *Avestā* or *Avistāk*.

It is well known to scholars that the religions of the Veda and the Avestā show certain marked differences in spite of their general agreement, that there are certain apparent inversions in the Veda and the Avesta which have called forth Martin Haug's well known theory of Indo-Iranian religious schism. 'Aśura' the Indian cognate of Iranian 'ahura', bears the sense of "demon" from the time of the later Vedic texts and, as if to match this, 'daéva', the Iranian correspondent of 'devá', has a bad sense in the Avestā. The Vedic 'Brāhmaṇas' and the 'Purāṇas' speak of war between the 'devas' and the 'asuras' and the religion of Zarathustra, on the other hand, is called "ahura-worshipping" and "anti-daévic". From these circumstances Haug supposed that there was a quarrel between the ancestors of the Indo-Aryans and the Irano-Aryans, leading to a religious split which caused the branding of the "gods" of one community as "demons" by the other. He thought that the 'asuras', whom the Brāhmaṇical gods are described as fighting, are the deities of the Iranians and he supposed that the Iranians replied by turning three of the Indian deities, 'Indra, 'Śarva' and 'Nāsatya', into demons. In support of his view that by 'asura' the Indians must have meant the Iranian gods, Haug cited the naming of three metres used in the 'Śukla Yajurveda Saṁhitā,' which, he thinks, exactly correspond to the metres of three of the Gāthā groups of the 'Yasna' as 'āsurı'. In further corroboration of his view, of quarrel between the Iranians and the Indians, he cites the case of Zarathustra's hits against the 'kavi', the 'krapan' and the 'usixs', "priests and prophets of the Devas", who, he supposes, are the Indian "kavi", *kalpaka'(?) and 'usij'. He supposes further that the ultimate cause of the quarrel was social, because he thinks, the Vedic Indians who are assumed to be cattle-tending nomads, used to plunder the pre-Zarathustrian Iranians, believed to be settled agriculturists. The quarrel, it is assumed, began before Zarathustra, but his teachings made the breach permanent.[2]

---

2. "Essays on the Religion of the Parsis' (Trubner's Oriental Series), Popular Edition, pp. 267-295.

This in brief, is Haug's theory, which found many adherents[3] and has profoundly affected their view of Vedic and Avestic religions. Later supporters of this theory have added other indications of hostility between the Indians and the Iranians, one of them being that the North is the direction of demons with the Iranians and the South with the Indians.[4]

This theory is certainly very fascinating, but is not supported by facts. Since 1862, when it was first published, we have learnt to take an analytical and historical view of the Vedic and Avestic texts and have got more light on early Iranian history. We know that the Vandidād which mentions 'Indra', etc. as demons, is a very late text, removed from Zarathustra's time by centuries, and breathing a spirit that is very different from that of the Gāthās.[5] The publication and interpretation of the Achaemenian inscriptions and of certain Assyrian inscriptions have thrown considerable light on the religion of a number of Iranian tribes of antiquity. All this new knowledge makes it impossible to accept Haug's theory in any form.

What Haug states as the ultimate cause of the clash between the Indians and the Iranians cannot be entertained for a moment. There is not a shred of evidence to support the vivid picture Haug has drawn about the political relations between the Indians and the Iranians in very ancient times.[6] There is nothing to show that the Indo-Aryans of the Vedas were nomads and the Irano-Aryans of the Avestā settled agriculturists. Cattle certainly formed the chief wealth of the Vedic Indians but tha Ṛgveda-saṁhitā distinctly shows that they were no mere cattle-tending nomads but also practised agriculture.[7] Though the Younger Avestā always praises agriculture, the Gāthās of Zarathustra only show solicitation for cattle. Consequently *textual evidence* is just the opposite of Haug's assumption. Whatever view may be held about the dates of the Veda and the Avestā, the greater antiquity of the former is indisputable. But on this ground it cannot be urged that the Vedic Aryans must have been mere cattle-tending nomads. Settled agriculture can no longer be taken as always a later development from nomadism. The two are now recognised as depending as much on the environment as on the age, or the race.[8] In fact, even in the present age; there are in Iran both agriculturists and cattle-tending nomads, occupying different geographical areas with different climatic conditions.[9] There is no proof, further, that the Indo-Aryans used to attack the territories of the Irano-Aryans and carry away their possessions. The Vedic Aryans did engage in forays on other peoples' cattle, but these appear to have belonged to their brethren or to the non-Aryans (*e. g.* the Kīkaṭas named in Ṛgveda-saṁhitā III. 53. 14) *in India.* The settled Iranians of antiquity were certainly exposed to the attacks of some nomadic tribes. But we know from Herodotus, whom we have now learnt to properly appreciate, that they were the Śakas (Book I, chs. 103-4, Bk, IV, Ch, 1, etc.). Tradition represents Zarathustra as born in Ādharbāizān or Media[10] both of which are far removed from any possible attacks from the side of the Vedic Aryans of India (or even Bactria) and are now known to have been actually overrun by Śakas.[11] The traditional enemies of Zarathustrians are the Tura=Turanians,[12] most probably those Śakas.

---

[3] Eduard Meyer in 'Encyclopaedia Britannica' l XXI, p. 204b; A. Hillebrandt, 'Vedische Mythologie', II, pp. 417ff. etc. C. Bartholomae, 'Zarathustra's Leben und Lehre', pp. 11ff., shows traces of Haug's influence. Though the influence of Haug's theory has very much declined in Europe, it is still universal in India. See, *e.g.*, J.J. Modi in 'Dante Papers', pp. 94ff.

[4] This has been a general view among a number of our contemporary Iranists in India.

[5] See Moulton, 'Early Zoroastrianism,' pp. viii and 34.

[6] 'Essays,' pp. 291-2.

---

[7] See H. Zimmer, 'Altindisches Leben,' pp. 235-243.

[8] See Minns in 'Cambridge Ancient History,' Vol. III, pp. 190-2.

[9] See A.H. Keane, 'Asia', Vol. II, pp. 486, 493.

[10] A.V.W. Jackson, 'Zoroaster', pp. 191-205.

[11] Herodotus, *op. cit.*

[12] The Shāhnāmā of Firdausi' translated by Warner, Vol. V, pp. 35ff. *et passim.* See also J.J. Modi in 'Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume', pp. 65-80, where he wrongly calls them Huns.

It is sometimes supposed that Zarathustra was a priest himself and hence his quarrel with rival priestly groups, 'kavi', 'uzikhs', *etc.*, believed by Haug to be Indo-Aryan priests. But that Zarathustra was a priest is not certain. *Zaotar* in Y. XXXIII. 6, used by Zarathustra for himself, does not mean "priest" ; the context seems to require the etymological sense of "invoker,"[13] practically the same as that of 'māthran,' "hymnist",[14] in Y. XXVIII. 7, XXXII. 13, L. 5, 6, LI. 8. Consequently there is no evidence in the Gāthās to show that Zarathustra was a "renegade priest". But a close study of the Gāthās does show that he went against certain practices of the priests, of priests, it is further evident, of his own country, the 'karpans',[15] *etc.*, referred to by him, and not of India. Those Iranian priests must have opposed his teachings very violently and made him turn to other lands for sympathetic hearing

[13] Geldner's contention that *hotṛ-zaotar* originally meant "sacrificer" ('Indo-Iranian Studies in honour of Darab Dastur Sanjana', pp. 277-281) goes against the evidence of the Vedas. The earliest function of the priest among the Aryans seems to have been simply the invocation of the god sought to be propitiated.

[14] The rendering of the word *māthran* as "prophet" by Bartholomae ('Altiranisches Worterbuch', 1179) has no justification for the Gāthās. It introduces a Hebrew idea without any authority. *Mantra*, in the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā, is the ordinary prayer or song of praise.

[15] *Kavi* seems to have meant only "chief", as in the case of *Kavi* Vistāspa, whether inimical or friendly to the "new religion." Later, of course, it was understood as meaning anti-Zarathustrian princes, except for members of the famous *Kavi* or Kayanian dynasty. Zarathustra himself was innocent of *ahuric* and *daivic* differentiation of words. We have no grounds for separating *kavā* from *kavi* as Haug does (p. 291). See Bartholomae, 'altir. Wb.,' under *kavay* (442-3). Haug's supposition that *kavāsakha*, *kavāri*, *etc.*, in the Veda mean "followers of kavā or adherents of kava" *i.e.*, of opponents of the Deva religion (p. 291) is absolutely wrong, for *kava-* is there a different stem altogether, the strong grade of *ku* ('what', 'bad'), as in *kavoṣṇa* ("lukewarm"), *etc.* The word *karpan* has no exact Indian equivalent and taking it to mean "Iranian priests" is certainly more natural than "Indian priests" through a hypothetical form.

(Y.XLVI), which he found in Eastern Irān[16], a land nearer to India than his native Ādharbāizān or Media.

It is usual to suppose that Zarathustra's reform was two-fold, religious and economic, the latter consisting in the settled way of agriculture in place of nomadism.[17] But I have pointed out above that the Gāthās only show solicitation for cattle[18], not a word is said by Zarathustra about agriculture, solicitation for it being a characteristic of the Younger Avestā. The fact is that Zarathustra set his face against all wickedness, slaughter of cattle being one form attacked by him. But as the cattle were slaughtered in the worship of certain gods (Y.XXXII. 8, 10, 14 *etc.*)[19] he felt no hesitation in branding these, too, as "evil ones," "wicked ones" (Y. XXX. 6, *etc.*), in the same way as Milton in his 'Paradise Lost' (Bk. I, ll. 392-405) described Moloch, before whom human victims used to be offered.[20] But as these cults were among the most cherished practices of the people, it was no wonder that our righteous prophet had great difficulty in finding a hearing in his native district (Y.XLVI). One of these gods, opposed by Zarathustra seems to have been Mithra, who continued to be a favourite deity in Iran in spite of him, finding in the Mihir Yast (§§

---

[16] Wilhelm Geiger has proved an eastern provenance of the Avestā. See Geiger-Sanjana, 'Civilization of the Eastern Iranians in Ancient Times,' Vol. II, pp. 88 111. C.F. Andreas also held this view on linguistic grounds.

[17] Moulton, 'Early Zoroastrianism', pp. 84-6; Bartholomae, 'Zarathustra's Leben und Lehre,' pp. 15–16; Reichelt, 'Avesta Reader', p. 185.

[18] See Y. XXIX (where Zarathustra appears as a divinely appointed protector of cattle—there are no grounds for giving an allegorical interpretation to this Gāthā, as has been done by Kazemzadeh-Iranschahr in 'Die Gathas von Zarathustra' and by Dr. I.J.S. Taraporewala in 'Sānj Vartamān Annual', 1929), XXXI. 9-10, XXXII, XLVIII (*hā*, "she", in v. 6 means the same being as *tām*, 'her', shortly before, in v. 5, *i.e.*, the "cow" and not 'Āramaiti') *et passim*.

[19] See Bartholomae, *op. cit.*

[20] Milton has here followed the practice of medieval writers in Europe of converting heathen gods into demons. See P. E. Dustoor in 'Anglia,' XLII, pp. 236-8.

113, 145—also in the 'Mihir Nyāī's, 12 and in Y. I. 11, II. 11, III. 13, IV, 16, VI. 10) and in the inscriptions of Artexerxes II and III, a place by the side of Ahura Mazdā himself and finding votaries in distant parts of Europe in the wake of Roman legionaries who learnt his worship from Iranian soldiers. All this is Iranian and not Indian. No slaughter of cattle is known in the cult of the Indian Mitra, corresponding to the *taurobolium* in Mithraism. About unscrupulous killing of animals in Iran, we know from Plutarch[21] that the Magians took pride in killing large numbers of certain creatures which they considered noxious, a custom which they succeeded in introducing into the Younger Avestā [the Vandīdād) when they became the ministers of the new religion. This is certainly against the spirit of the noble Zarathustra whose heart was so full of the milk of human kindness for the dumb creation of Ahura Mazda. So even here we do not go out of Iran.

All this shows that Zarathustra's opponents were men of his own land. We have no grounds for believing that his clash took place with the ancestors of the Vedic Aryans before they entered India, for he could hardly have lived earlier than the seventh century B.C., where tradition places him,[22] and it is impossible to bring down the earlier portions of the Vedas to such a late date. The geographical references in the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā show that the text was formed *in India* and we cannot hold with Haug[23] and his pupil Hillebrandt[24] that its earlier portions were composed in what may be called Iranian territory.[25] The Avesta shows no hostility to the Indians. In the Avestan Genesis (Vandīdād I), India is described as one of the good lands created by Ahura Mazdā and the only evils counter-created by Aṅra Mainyu are "untimely menstruation ('daxsta'[26]) and "untimely (?) heat" (§ 18) and no moral delinquency or religious malpractice. The only thing Indian which has appeared as abomination in the eyes of the writers of the Younger Avestā is the asceticism of the Buddhists, which goes against the entire spirit of Zarathustrianism[27] and, possibly, also their image worship.[28] And certainly, introduction of Buddhism in Irān took place long after Zarathustra preached his message. The Ṛgveda-saṁhitā makes some references to tribes or individuals whom we can safely take to be Iranians,[29] but no hostility is shown towards them. In fact, Indians and Iranians were always friendly neighbours in antiquity, ever ready to learn from each other.[30] Consequently an Indo-Iranian religious clash should be considered a pure myth.

---

[21] 'Isis and Osiris', Ch. 46.

[22] See Jackson, 'Zoroaster', pp. 150-173, 'Zoroastrian Studies', pp. 249-251; A Meillet, Trois Conferences sur le Gathas de l'Avesta', pp. 21-32; and my paper 'The Date of Zarathustra' in the forthcoming 'Irani Commemoration Volume', in which I have shown that tradition gives an approximate and not an exact date for Zarathustra, West's correction being therefore uncalled for, and that this approximate date is substantially correct.

[23] 'Essays', pp. 288 and 291-2.

[24] 'Vedische Mythologie,' I, pp. 499-527 *et passim*.

[25] See A.A. Macdonell and A.B. Keith in 'Vedic Index', Vol. I, pp. 472-3 and Keith in 'Cambridge History of India', Vol. I, p. 87.

We are also in a better position to understand the true significance of the opposition in meaning between 'ásura' and

---

[26] Bartholomae renders by "bodily infirmity" ('air. Wb.' 667), though he recognises the other meaning in Vd. XV. 9 and elsewhere.

[27] Or we might say of Irān, for asceticism or celibacy could never find much support there; see Yt. XVII. 10, 54.60 and IV. 47ff; compare also the words of Herodotus in I. 135-6 and the fate of Manichaeism in Iran.

[28] Yt. XIII. 16 and Vd. XIX. 1 (also XI. 9 and XIX. 43, a late addition wanting in the Pahlavī commentary). See J. Darmestetor in 'S.B.E.,' IV, p. 29, n. 3 and XXIII, p. 184, n 2. There are no reasons for doubting that *Gaotəma* in Yt. XIII, 16 stands for the followers of Gautama Buddha. The collocation of *Gaotəma* in the Yast with *Būiti* or *Būidi=Bodhi* (*sattva*), *i.e.* Buddha, in the Vandīdād makes the reference to Buddhism certain. See 'Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies', London, Vol. VI, pp. 279-283. There are extensive remains of Buddhism in Bāmiyān and other parts of Afghanistan.

[29] Parsu, Pārthava, Paktha, Kamboja, *etc*.

[30] The 'Bhavishya Purāṇa' (Brahma Parvan, Sāmba Ākhyāna) speaks of Maga priests as brought from Irān (Śvetadvīpa) to help in the worship at the sun temple erected in Multan by Sāmba. Cf. also 'Vishṇu Purāṇa' II. 4. 69-70, 'Agni Purāṇa' 109.21 and 'Padma Purāṇa', I. 8.34—37.

'ahura' or deva and 'daēva.' The word 'ásura' occurs 108 times in the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā and barring 14 passages, it means there "a divine spirit", *i. e.*, a 'devá.'[31] These 14 passages[32] and almost all other Vedic texts[33] and all later literature understand the word as meaning "demon". Haug's supposition that the 'Asuras' are the gods of the Iranians in these later texts is absolutely groundless : the contexts clearly show that "demons" are meant. We now know that the belief in demons has been practically universal. We find it in the mythology and the folklore of every nation. It comes from a fear-complex innate in man,[34] which nowadays manifests itself as *bacillophobia* among "enlightened" people. If there are 'àsuras' ("demons") the 'devàs' ("gods") must fight them, for the Vedic Indians would not worship any but the "god." Those people were as much opposed to "devil worship" as were the Zarathustrians. Hence, we must read in the deterioration of the meaning of the word 'ásura' from "Spirit" to "Evil Spirit," the same process as in Greek *daimonioa* (Deity)> English *demon* or in English *ghost* as "spirit">*ghost* as "goblin," *etc.*[35]

---

31. Except X. 93.14, where it means either an 'Assyrian' or a 'lord' or 'prince' (as *ahura* sometimes means in the Avestā—see Bartholomae, 'air. Wb. 293),

3 II. 30.4, V. 40.5, 9, VI. 22.4, VII. 13.1, VII. 99. 5, VIII. 96.9, VIII. 97.1, X. 53.4, X. 82.5, X. 131.4, X. 138.3, X. 157.4 and X. 170.2.

33. We are to except a small number of passages like 'Taittirīya-saṁhitā I.4.45 (='Mādhyandina-saṁhitā' VIII. 24. 'Maitrāyaṇīya-saṁhitā' I. 3.39, 'Kāṭhaka-saṁhitā IV. 13), IV. 2.10 (='Mādhyandina-saṁhitā' XVI. 7), IV.4.9. 'Atharvaveda-saṁhitā' I. 10. 1, V. 27. 1 (='Taittirīya' IV. 1.8, 'Mādhyandina-saṁhitā' XXVII. 12. 'Maitrāyaṇīya-saṁhitā' II. 12. 6, 'Kāṭhaka-saṁhitā' XVIII. 17) and, of course, a number of Ṛgvedic verses occurring in the other Vedas.

34. A.G. Tansley, 'New Psychology', pp. 142-3; G. Coster, 'Psycho-Analysis for Normal People', Ch. IV.

35. 'New English Dictionary', Vol. III, pp. 184c-185a and Vol. IV, pp. 148b-149c. See M. Breal, 'Semantics', translated by Mrs. H. Cust, pp, 100ff., for deterioration of meanings of words. R.L. Turner in 'Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies', Vol. V, p. 150, accepts my view about this particular semantic change. He had earlier expressed similar ideas to Dr. I.J.S. Taraporewala.

The transition between the good meaning of the word ‘asura’ and the sense of “demon” may, perhaps, be found in Ṛgveda-saṁhitā X. 151. 3, where the ‘devas’ are said to have placed ‘śraddhā/’ (“faith”) in the ‘terrible asuras.’[36] These ‘ásuras’ are certainly ‘devás (“gods”) as the next verse shows[37] and they are probably the terrible Maruts[38] (“Storm Gods”), who are called the sons of Rudra, the old Thunder God, also called an ‘ásura’ in the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā II. 1.6 V. 42- 11, *etc.*, and elsewhere. This Rudra degenerates into a “Rudrādhyāya of the Yajurveda[39] and is practically treated as an outcasted god or a demon in the later ritual.[40] In the connexion, one would naturally think of Vāyu who in the earlier texts of the Younger Avesta is a 'yazata'[41] but degenerates into a demon in the later texts.[42]

---

[36] Yáthá devá’ ásureṣu śraddhā’mugréshu cakrire/ eváṁ bhojéṣu yájvasu asmā’kam uditaṁkṛdhi// “As the gods (*devas*) have placed Faith in the terrible *asuras*, so bring about our advancement among the sacrificing patrons.”

[37] Śraddhāṁ *devā* yájamānā vāyūgopā ūpāsate/ śraddhāṁ hṛdayyáyā’kūtyā śraddhayā vindatevásu// “The ‘deva’ sacrificers, protected by Vāyu, worship Faith, they worship her with a hearty purpose. Through Faith one obtains wealth.”

[38] Cf. ‘vāyugopa’ (“protected by Vayu”) in v. 4 (for the connexion between the Maruts and Vāyu, see Ṛv. S. I. 134. and I. 142.12) and Yá ugrā arkámānṛcūrādhṛsaṭāsaojasā/ marūdbhir agna āgahi// Yéśubhrā ghorāvarpasaḥ sukṣatrāso risādasaḥ / mārudbhirana ā’gahi// I. 19. 4-5. “Agni, come with the Maruts, *who are terrible*, and sing songs, unoverpowered, with their strength. Agni, come with the Maruts, who are] bright, *of terrible aspect*, of good dominion, devourers of their enemies.”

[39] Cf. ‘Mādhyandina-saṁhitā’ XVI. 20-21.

[40] After any offering is made to Agni Sviṣṭakṛt=Rudra ( Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa’ I.7.3.8), the Adhvaryu has to touch water, as he does whenever he names the Rakṣas and has also to sprinkle water on the *sañcara* (the ground over which the Adhvaryu walks for offering oblation)—as the orthodox Hindu would do now when a low-caste Śūdra (*i.e.*, a Caṇḍāla) passes by a holy place! See *e.g.*, ‘Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra’, II.4.1, enjoining *abhyukṣaṇa* of the *sañcara* after the *yāga* to Agni Sviṣṭakṛt (=Rudra) in the Darśa-pūrṇamāsa sacrifice.

It is possible, however, that 'āsura' in Ṛgveda-saṁhitā X. 151. 3 means "lesser gods", as does the Greek word 'daimōnia' (as opposed to 'theoɪ', which also comes to mean "demons" in later Greek).[43] When a language possesses two or more words of identical meaning, an innate sense of economy often leads the speakers to use them for different shades of meaning.[44] 'Asura' may have thus come to mean "lesser gods", (what can be called in later language 'deva-yonis'), and thence "demons". In this connexion, I may cite an interesting passage in the 'Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa' XVII 1. 1, 'devā vai svargaṁ lokam āyan. teṣāṁ daivā ahɪyanta' ("the 'devas' attained to heaven and the 'daivas' were displaced from their presence"), where the 'daivas' (="belonging to or come from 'devas'," *i.e.*, deva-yonayaḥ), mean a lower kind of gods. One would also think of Ṛgveda-saṁhitā V. 40-5 and X. 131. 4, where the demons Svarbhānu and Namuci are called 'āsurá,' a derivative of 'ásura', formed exactly in the same way as 'daiva' of the 'Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa' is from 'deva'. "Lesser gods" would be thus "beings connected with 'devas' or 'asuras'," but not exactly 'devas' or 'asuras' themselves. Transition from that to the sense of "demon"[45] is an easy step.

The degradation of meaning of 'ásura' may have happened in another way. "The so-called pejorative tendency," says Bréal, "is the result of a very human disposition which prompts us to veil, to attenuate, to disguise ideas which are disagreeable, wounding or repulsive."[46] It is very natural to avoid calling demons *demon*, substituting euphemistically the term *spirit*, in the same way as the maleficent Rudra is called in the Vedas 'Śiva' (*i.e.*, "beneficent") to keep him in good humour. Superstitious persons in Bengal in supreme dread of ghosts will not take the name 'bhūt (= Sanskrit 'bhūta', "ghost"), particularly at night, and if they must refer to a ghost, they substitute the term 'debtā' (=Skt. 'devatā'), "deity", as a snake is called latā' (=Skt. 'latā'), *i.e.*, "creeper" at night and not 'sāp' (=Skt. 'sarpa'), "snake." Similar ways of expression are current in other provinces and countries.

---

[41] Y. XX. 24, XXV. 5 and Yt. XV (also 'Sīrozah', I. 21 and II. 21).

[42] Vd. V. 8, 9, X. 14, 'Aogemadaēcā' 77-81. The late passages from the 'Sīrozah' cited in the previous note seem clearly to suggest the existence of an aspect of Vāyu that was shaped by Aṅra Mainyu.

[43] Liddell and Scott, Greek English Lexicon', p. 322.

[44] Bréal, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 ff.

[45] In Poland, the Domovoy or the demi-god of the hearth-fire, perhaps the most honoured spirit among the Slavic peasantry, is called "the devil' (W.R.S. Ralston, 'The Songs of the Russian People,' pp. 123-4).

Of the explanations given above for the way the word 'asura' may have deteriorated in meaning, the last is the simplest and, perhaps, the best one. Whichever explanation is accepted, this much is sure that the Vedic texts have preserved ample evidence of a perfectly natural semantic development of the term,[47] without a trace of violent religious clash.

Haug's contention, that the use of the term 'āsuri' for certain Indian metres resembling Avestan metres shows that the Vedic Aryans meant by 'āsura' the gods of the Zarathustrians, is based on a sad mistake, for these "metres[48] *do not* resemble Avestan metres and the nomenclature is very late. The 'āsuri' Gāyatri has *in all* 15 syllables in the verse, the 'āsurī' Ushṇih 14 and the 'āsuri' Paṅkti 11. This is the total number of syllables *in the verse* and not in each line, in the same way as these metres have in the 'ārṣī' form 24, 28 and 40 syllables respectively in the verse.[49] But the 'Gāthā Ahunavaiti', which Haug believes to be corresponding to the 'āsurī' Gāyatrī, has three lines of 16 or 15 syllables each, generally making a total of 14 syllables, the 'Vohu-Kshathra Gāthā', supposed by him to correspond to the 'āsurī' Oshṇih, three lines of 14 syllables each, with a total of 42, and the Gāthās 'Ustāvaiti' and 'Spentā Mainyu', which he takes as corresponding to the 'āsurī' Paṅkti, have respectively five lines of 11 and four lines of 11 syllables each, with totals of 55 and 40 ![50] Hence the alleged agreement between Avestan and 'āsurī' metres is absolutely non-existent. Consequently 'āsurī' cannot mean "of the asura-worshipping Iranians." The name 'āsurī' is purely fictitious like the other names, 'daivī,' 'prājāpatyā', 'brāhmī', *etc.*

---

[46] 'Semantics', p. 100.

[47] We have a parallel to the deterioration of the Indian word *asura* in Ancient Armenia. Corresponding to the *daevas* of Ancient Irān and probably under its influence, the Armenians believed in a kind of demoniacal beings whom they called the *devs*. For these *devs* was also used, according to M.H. Ananikian, the term *ais* ('Mythology of All Races', Vol. VII, p. 86), which is perhaps connected with Latin *anses*, Anglo-Saxon *ese*, Old Norse *aesir* and Sanskrit *asura*.

[48] It is hardly right to talk of "metres" of prose formulas of the Yajurveda.

Turning now to the semantic history of the word 'daeva' in Iran, however, we find ourselves in a different situation. No individual seems to have influenced the semantic degradation of 'āsura.' But it is not so with word 'daéva'. Prior to Zarathustra, the word bore a good sense, as we find in the theophoric name of the Median prince 'Daiukku' whom Sargon of Assyria sent into exile about 715 B.C.[51] and of 'Deiokes' who founded the Median empire in 709 B.C.[52] Coming to the time of Zarathustra we find sufficient indications about the same exalted meaning of the term 'daéva,' for we find him lamenting in Y. XXXII. 4 that persons doing wicked things (violence to cattle—see verses 8, 10, 12, 14 and 16) were called "beloved of the daevas" ('daevo-zustā') ! As violence to cattle, which caused his heart to bleed, was often perpetrated in the worship of 'daevas',[53] he set his face against them and put them in the same category as wicked mortals.[54] There was, perhaps, another reason for his opposition to these gods. It is clear from the Gāthās that Zarathustra was a thorough-going theist and worshipped only Ahura Mazdā.[55] So he ignored the 'daevas', not with passive indifference but with active hatred. The irony of fate; however, led his followers to relapse to the worship of those very 'daevas', including Mithra, whom the prophet had rejected; they only gave them the name of 'yazatas'.[56] But, as generally happens, though losing sight of the founder's *spirit*, they kept to his *word* and gave up the use of term 'daeva' for the "gods" (or "angels") whom they worshipped. In a number of passages of the Younger Avestā, the word seems to mean "gods of other people"[57] and finally it comes to mean "demon", a sense which the word has ever after borne in Irān[58] and in such dialects of modern Indo-Aryan as have come under the influence of Persian.[59] Thus Zarathustra's attitude towards the 'daevas' has in course of time affected the meaning of the term 'daeva' and we can clearly trace the process of its degeneration.

---

[49] Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, *Ch.* on Vedic metres.

[50] Jackson, Zoroastrian Studies.

[51] 'Cambridge Ancient History,' III, p. 52.

[52] Herodotus, I, 96-102. Certain details of Deioke's life, as described by Herodotus, show that we should identify him with 'Daiukku', though the 'Cambridge Ancient History' (III. p. 51, n. 1) denies it.

[53] *E.g.* in the *taurobolium* in the worship of Mithra, very likely referred to in Y. XXXII. 14 and XLVIII. 10.

I may here draw the attention of scholars to the recently discovered long inscription of Xerxes I, found at Persepolis by the expedition of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago under Professor E. Herzfeld. In the fourth paragraph of that inscription Xerxes says that among the lands which he conquered 'were such where, before the Daivas were worshipped; then, by Ahuramazda's will, of such temples of the Daivas I sapped the foundations, and I ordained 'the Daivas shall not be worshipped !' Where the Daivas had been worshipped, there I worshipped Ahuramazda together with 'Ṛtam the exalted.'[60] The translation is by Herzfeld; the text is, unfortunately, not yet published. This inscription shows that even in the time of Xerxes I (486-465 B.C.), more than a century after the time of Zarathustra (c. 628-551 B.C.), the word 'daeva' still bore in Irān the meaning of "god". Consequently Zarathustra has not himself altered the meaning of the word 'deva'—'daeva', though the change is ultimately due to circumstances for which he is responsible. That change, it should be noted, was due to the course of religious history *in Irān*, which has nothing to do with the religion of the Vedic Indo-Aryans.

---

[54] See Y. XXIX. 4, XXX. 6, XXXII. 3, 5, (XLIV. 20), XLVIII. 1, (XLIX. 4). The zealous Vaiṣṇava in some parts of our country, (*e.g.*, in Bengal), would look upon the Mother Goddess as a "demoness", because her cult encourages animal slaughter.

[55] The Ameshā Spentas whom he occasionally addresses and adores are not distinct entities but seem to be aspects of Ahura Mazdā himself in 'acintya bhedābheda sambandha' ("inscrutable relation of difference and non-difference"), as we may put it in Indian terminology, when they are not human qualities or states. See Maria W. Smith, 'Studies in the Syntax of the Gathas of Zarathushtra,' Philadelphia, 1929.

[56] But the term 'ahura' was retained for Apām Napāt and the Waters. the Achaemenians used the term 'baga', which was perhaps the usual popular designation for a god.

[57] Vd. XVIII. 62, VII. 36 (the use of the word in § 55 and elsewhere in the sense of "demon" indicates this meaning is also present here).

[58] For some exceptions see Noldeke in 'Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik', Vol. II, p. 318.

[59] *E.g.*, Urdu has 'dev' or 'deo' and Sindhi 'deu' in the sense of "demon".

To suppose that the writers of the 'Brāhmaṇas' meant by 'Asuras,' whom they described as constantly fighting with the 'Devas,' the Iranian people, as K.N. Sitaram does,[61] is just as wrong as to believe with R.G. Bhandarkar that they were the Assyrians,[62] or that they were the non-Aryan natives of India, as assumed by A.P. Banerji-Sastri.[63] The 'Asuras' of the 'Brāhmaṇas' were not ethnics but were "demons" as the 'Devas' were "gods". That is the only conclusion that a careful study of these texts can lead us to. The Vedic Aryans certainly believed in both "gods" and "demons". A modern scholar may believe in neither but he should not "rationalise" in the realm of these ancient texts, if he wants to lay claim to the name of a scientific historian.

That some of the gods of the Vedic pantheon figure as *yazatas* in the Avestā, while others as *daevas*, instead of proving

[60] See Roland G. Kent in 'J.A.O.S.', Vol. 56, p. 213.

[61] 'The Journal of the K.R. Cama Oriental Institute,' No. 2, pp. 7-8.

[62] 'J.B.B.R.A.S.', XXV, pp. 76-81.

[63] 'Asura India'.

Haug's theory, gives the death-blow to it, for if there were spite and consequent desire to turn the gods of the opponents into demons, why would this be confined only to three deities, and the others, forming a large number, still receive fervent devotion? Haug's theory also cannot explain why Indra-Vṛtrahan was split up into two entities, one figuring in the list of demons and the other of gods. In fact, the turning of Indra, etc., to demons belongs to the Vandīdād, now recognised as perhaps the latest text in the Avestā, and that was also originally confined to a solitary passage, Vd. X. 9, for Vd. XIX. 43 where also it occurs is found only in the Vandīdād Sādeh[64] and is wanting in the Pahlavī commentary.[65] Whatever may be the value of the Pahlavī commentary from the *exegetical* point of view, its *textual* value is certainly higher than that of manuscripts of the Vandīdād Sādeh, which are later in date. In fact §§ 11-43 of the Pargard appear to be later additions, breaking the connexion between §§ 1-10 and 44-47, and §§ 42 and 43 seem to have been added by the redactors of the Vandīdād Sādeh to bridge the gulf between §§ 41 and 44 and thus help in making the entire Pargard read as one whole. Consequently the demonhood of Indra, *etc.*, is not a Zarathustrian doctrine" but the statement of one individual writer, the author of Vd. X. 9, the later writer of XIX. 43 simply taking over matter from X. 9 and the Pahlavī writers basing their scheme on this text. Elsewhere in the Avestā (Y XXVII. 1, Yt. I. 31, IV. 2, 4, X. 97, 134, XVIII. 2), we have lists of demons given, but Indra, *etc.*, do not appear there. *Is this not significant*?

It may now be asked, can it be explained why the author of Vd. X. 9 turned Indra, *etc.*, to demons at all? It is difficult to get a satisfactory answer to this question. In this Pargard Zarathustra asks Ahura Mazdā what is to be done to prevent the Druj from rising from the dead body and defiling the living (§ 1). Ahura Mazdā 'prescribes the recitation of certain passages of the Gāthās which are to be read twice (§ 4), some thrice (§ 8) and the others four times (§ 12). He further lays down the uttering of certain charms after these three recitals in the form "I drive away such and such demon from this house, *etc.*" The demons named in this closing formula after two-fold recitals are Aṅra Mainyu, the chief devil, (§ 5), and Nasu, the corpse-demon (§ 6), after three-fold recitals Indra,', Sauru or Saurva ('saurum,' vv. ll. 'sauru,' 'saorum,' 'saorəm 'surəm'—Geldner's edition, III, p. 82) and Nāṅhaithya (§ 9) and Tauru and Zairi (§ 10) and after fourfold recitals Aesma (§ 13) and the Varənya 'daevas' (§ 14). While summing up, however, Ahura Mazdā says that these words smite down Aṅra Mainyu, Aesma, the daevas of Māzainya and all Zairi (§ 16) ; Indra, Sauru and Nānhaithya, and Tauru and Zairi are not specified again by name, but are included in 'vispānām daevānām' ("of all demons"). Now, this is the only passage in the Avestā (besides the interpolated Vd. XIX. 43, which offers no additional light), where not only Indra, Sauru aad Nānhaithya but also Tauru and Zairi are named. Consequently, we do not get any help from parallel passages for determining their characters.[66]

---

[64] See edition by Brockhaus, Leipzig 1850, p. 183.

[65] See edition by Dastur Hoshang Jamasp and M.M. Gandevia, Bombay 1907, Vol. I, p. 611.

But the fact that the demons named are chased away from the corpse may suggest that they are connected in some way or other with death. This is certainly true for the corpse-demon Nasu[67], and Aṅra Mainyu as the author of all evil must be held responsible for death also,[68] and he is actually called here and in other passages of the Younger Avestā "deathful" ('pourumahrka')[69] Akatasha also, as the name implies, is the "shaper of evil."[70] Tauru and Zairi are understood by the later Pahlavi texts as opponents of Haurvatāṭ and Amərətāṭ[71] and their names seem to suggest that they cause death.[72] 'Aeshma' in the Gāthās is "violence" only, though Jackson takes him as already personified there.[73] In the Younger Avestā 'Aeshma' is certainly a demon of violence.[74] The Māzainya (Māzandarān) and Varənya (Gīlān) countries are the favourite resorts of demons according to the Younger Avestā,[75] and probably the districts were as malarious then as now.[76]

---

[66] The Pahlavī account about these 'daēvas' is extremely confused. See Dhalla, 'Zoroastrian Theology,' pp. 264-5.

[67] Jackson, 'Zoroastrian Studies,' p. 101; Dhalla, 'Zoroastrian Theology', pp. 165-6 etc.

[68] See 'Bundahisn XXVIII. 2 ('S.B.E.' V, p. 105).

[69] Cf. also Y. XXX. 4 in the Gāthās.

[70] Jackson, 'Zoroastrian Studies,' p. 93.

[71] Dhalla, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

Let us see what we can learn about Indra, Sauru and Nāṅhaithya. They have been recognised as the Indian deities, Indra, Sarva (=Rudra) and Nāsatya. The phonetic forms in which the second name is found in the different manuscripts of the Avestā may make his identification with Saurua and his Indian provenance somewhat doubtful. But when Indra is certainly our Indra and Nāṅhaithya as certainly Nāsatya=Aśvin of the Vedas, Sauru also should be recognised (by what Mīmāṁsakas call 'sandaṁśa nyāya' or "tongs-logic") as an Indian deity and, therefore, his identification with Sarva=Rudra-Śiva should not be doubted. Now, Rudra, either in the Vedic form or as in the Purāṇic trinity, is a god connected with destruction. I have noted above how in the later Vedic period he had begun to degrade into almost a demon. Śiva in the later age is also a quick-tempered god, given to destruction. Consequently an Iranian writer of the first or second century before or after Christ (the probable date of the Vandīdād or,

---

72. 'Tauru,' meaning "overpowerer" and 'Zairi' "poisoner" or "poison" (cf. Y. IX. 11, 'axīm...vīsavantəm *zairitəm*, yim upairi vīs raoδaṭ... *zairitəm*, where poison is called "yellow" or "greenish").

73. *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

74. *Ibid.*, pp. 89-91. 'Asmodaius' of the apocryphal book of 'Tobit' seems clearly to be this fiend, as he violently kills one after another seven husbands of Sarah. The scene, it should be remembered, is laid in Media. The date of the book (third to first century B.C.) is also suggestive. It is just the period of the elaboration of Avestic demonology. L.H. Gray's rejection of the identity of Asmodaius with Aéshma (daéva) in 'Foundations of Iranian Religions', p. 186, is not convincing.

75. Y. XXVII. 1, Yt. V. 22, IX. 4, X. 97, XIII. 137, Vd. X. 4, 16, XVII, 9, 10.

76. Keane's 'Asia,' Vol. II, 483.

at least, of portions of it) could easily include his name to swell his list of demons, particularly in connexion with death.

The case of Indra is a little difficult. There is no ground for believing that the author of the Vandīdād knew him to be the same personality as the 'yazata Vərəthragna' or that the malificent aspect of the deity was purposely separated from him and labelled as the demon Indra. He must have been taken as a distinct being altogether. I have already pointed out that in the Younger Avestā the gods of other peoples have been known as *daevas*. But as *daeva* also meant "demon", the gods of other peoples would be easily looked down upon as demons. It is probably thus that the Indian Indra was called a demon. Why the choice of the writer of Vd. X. 9 fell on Indra at all is difficult to see. *The reason may lie in the immoral traits that Indra had by now developed in Indian mythology.*[77] Pahlavī writers described Indra as an opponent of 'Artavahist', the archangel of righteousness (Dhalla, 'Zoroastrian Theology,' p. 264). Consequently he may have been taken as the personification of unrighteousness. But if we are to use the criterion of the context, we may suppose that Indra was somehow connected with death. There may have still lingered some reminiscence of Indra's earlier character as a god of war. Those who fell in battle went to Indra's heaven[78] and might have been taken as having lost their lives through Indra.[79] Consequently, if Aeshma stands for death by violence, the Varənya and Māzainya demons for death by disease and Tauru and Zairi by poisoning,[80] Indra, in Vd. X. 9, may stand for death on the field of battle.[81] We may, therefore, take Indra in Vd. X. 9 as

[77] Compare the Purāṇic account of his so-called amour with Ahalyā which arose from a misunderstanding of an older Vedic nature myth, 'indraḥ ahalyāyai jāraḥ' of the subrahmaṇya' formula really meaning that Indra was the fructifier of (even) the fallow and (a-halyā').

[78] 'Mythology of All Races,' Vol. VI, p. 132.

[79] As Oδin, the god of war, was believed in Scandinavia to take a toll of the lives of those fallen in battle, Chadwick, 'The Cult of Oδin', pp. 7 ff-

[80] 'Bundahisn' XXVIII. 11.

[81] The Dīnkart (IX, 32. 3) calls Indra "the fighter" (or "slayer" ?), 'kūśitār'.

a demon of death in war. But we cannot be sure on the point.[82]

The demonhood of Nāṅhaithya does not offer any difficulty. It seems to be based on a wrong etymology of the name Nāsatya. The word seems to have been analysed as 'na' (="not") and satya (="true" or "truthful").[83] He must have been thus taken as the demon of falsehood, a sin hated by Iranians.[84] Whatever may be the basis of the demonhood of Indra and Sauru, Nāṅhaithya can by no means be brought into connexion with death.

To sum up : Sauru, Indra and Nāṅhaithya are Indian deities, believed to be connected with evil—the first as causing destruction, the second standing for either unrighteousness or death in war, and the last leading to falsehood—and hence they were mentioned as demons.[85] Indian deities were chosen, because they were in some way known. This does not show any special antagonism against India as such, because only such deities were selected for 'demonification' as were understood or misunderstood as "harmful" and none of the noble and popular Indian gods of the period figure here. 'Nāsatya' had been practically forgotten in India. 'Indra', though still theoretically the king of the gods, had paled into insignificance before 'Vishṇu' and 'Śiva'. 'Śarva' could not have been a popular designation of 'Rudra, at this period, for the god was worshipped as 'Śiva', 'Mahādeva', 'Paśupati', 'Śaṅkara', *etc.* It is possible that we have deities of other countries represented in the other demons appearing in Vd. Pargard X. It should be further noted that Indra, Sauru and Nāṅhaithya do not yet seem to have entered the list of "arch-fiends", for Aka Manah is wanting in the list and we have Nasu and Akatasha extra. Consequently, we cannot take Vd. X. § 5 ff. as mentioning Aṅra Mainyu with his "archfiends". In fact, the idea of "Seven Archfiends" (with or without Aṅra Mainyu) seems a late development, in imitation of the "Seven Archangels".[86] Consequently we have no grounds for believing that the reform of Zarathustra had any special antipathy towards the religion of the Vedas. The Avestā does not show it, beyond the casual mention as demons of Indra, Sauru and Nāṅhaithya in Vd. X. 9 and its later copy in Vd. XIX : 43, and the uncertainty about the characters of these three personalities which the writers of the Bundahisn and the Dinkart betray disproves it even for the Pahlavi period.

---

[82] L.H. Gray's supposition that Indra was taken as causing "winter torrents and heavy rains that bring malaria in their wake, such as those which prevail along the southern Caspian coast in the land of the 'Māzainyan devils" ('Foundations of the Iranian Religions', p. 182) is too imaginative to be acceptable. That the Pahlavī texts connect him with apostacy (Dhalla, 'Zoroastrian Theology', p. 264) shows that he was not a well-understood *Iranian* "deity" or "demon" of the definite character Gray's theory would suggest. He must be taken as a foreign (Indian) *deva*.

[83] Darmesteter in 'S.B.E.' Vol. IV, 1st ed., Introduction, p. lxxii. We should not be hard on the Iranian author for this mistake, for the Indian authorities also were not quite sure about the etymology of the word. Cf. *Nirukta* VI. 13 and Pāṇini VI. 3. 76. Modern scholars too have not succeeded in solving its riddle.

[84] For the Persian attitude towards lying, see Herodotus I. 138.

[85] It is interesting to note that in Vd. X. 9 only Nāṅhaithya has been called a 'daēva,' and not Indra Sauru. But not much capital can be made out of this, because Aṅra Mainyu, Naru, Tautu and Zairi also have not been called 'daēvas'. In Vd. XIX 43, however, caeh of these beings is called a 'daēva'.

Some words will now have to be said about the alleged reversal in the localisation of the demons in India and Irān. We must first of all note that the *south* is *not* the direction of the *demons* in India but of the *Pitṛs* or "departed ancestors", who are divine beings watching over the welfare of their descendants. There are traces in the Vedic texts, too, of the north being the region of demons: see 'Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa' I.2.4.10, where the gods are described as remarking about the demons, 'udañco vai naḥ palāyya mucyante', "they escape from us running northwards".[87] The 'utkara' ("dustbin") is constructed to the north of the 'vedī' (altar) and the demons are ceremonially carried there in the 'stambayajurharaṇa' ritual of the 'Darśapūrṇamāsa' sacrifices.[88] Similarly, after the construction of the 'vedī', the 'sphya' (="wooden sword") which is taken as a substitute for the 'vajra' (Indra's thunderbolt), is hurled to the north to hit the demons and, after them, the rivals of the sacrificer, if any.[89] In later texts, the *south-west* became the direction of Nirṛti, the demoness of destruction. This idea may have developed in an area where the south-western wind was harmful. It is probably on meteorological grounds that the Iranians placed their demons in the north, from which direction blew the bleak continental winds, which were not impeded by the mountains.[90] Yt. III. 9, 16 and XXII. 25 read with Yt. XXII. 42[91] associate the north wind with the demons. Yt. XXII, which is fragmentary in character, presents the Zarathustrian eschatology. § 7 says that at the end of the third night when the dawn appears, the soul of the pious man is greeted with the sweet-scented wind blowing from the south, and § 25 states that the soul of the wicked man is troubled with foul-scented wind blowing from the snowy north, § 42 adding that the fiend Busyāsta rushes from the north. This clearly shows that the north was a region causing physical discomfort, fit to be associated with the demons. The two northern districts, Māzan and Gīlān, which are known as the homes of two classes of demons, are extremely damp and malarial, though very fertile. Another ground for associating the north with the demons may have lain in the frequent exposure to attacks from northern nomads, a phenomenon which continued till the Russian occupation of the Attack in 1881.[92] It is not against Indian marauders that the ancient Iranians bore a grudge. If it were so, they would have made the east the direction of demons. It is Śakas, Hūṇas and Tartars that have been in different ages the scourge of Irān, with the result that even in the present day no love is lost between an Iranian and a Turkomān, even when close neighbours.[93] I might also point out that the home of the demon Azi Dahāka is placed in 'Bawri' ( = "Babylonia").[94] Firdausi makes him a king of Arabia.

---

[86] We can also trace the influence of the Seven Davils of Babylonia, whose notion diffused far and wide. See R. Campbell Thompson, 'The Devils and Evil Spirit of Babylonia,' Vol. I, pp. XLIII-XLIV. See also S.H. Langdon in 'J.R.A.S.' 1934, pp. 46-56.

[87] In 'Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa' I.2,17, however, we have 'udīcī vai manuṣyāṇāṁ dik, ("a north is the direction of men").

---

[88] Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa', I.2.4. 18, 'Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra', II. 6.12.

[89] 'Ś,B.' I.2.5.22, 'K.Ś.S.', II. 6.34.

[90] Keane, 'Asia,' Vol. II, p. 485.

[91] From Westergaard's text. Geldner omits Yt. XXII in his edition.

[92] Keane, 'Asia,' Vol. II, pp. 482-3.

In this connexion, I may briefly reply to what Dr. S.K. Belvalkar has said in his 'Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Fellowship Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy', Part I, p. 31 : "Finally, the most puzzling fact about these Brāhmaṇas is the relation in which their religion and mythology stand to those of the Avestic people, the deities and the demons of the former becoming respectively the devils and the gods of the latter, the ritual of the one being made deliberately antagonistic to that of the other : if the Brāhmaṇas, for instance, considered the north-east as the great direction of triumph and auspiciousness, the Avesta not failing to locate their hell in that region." The "facts" stated here are not all correct. The north and not the north-east is the Avestan (and Pahlavī) direction of hell and the demons,[95] and I have shown above that there are traces of similar ideas in ancient India. In spite of the 'Aitareya Brāhmaṇa' (I. 14) story referred to by Belvalkar, we cannot be sure that the north-eastern direction was called "unconquered" ('aparājita')[96] because the gods could not be conquered in that direction. The name may be due, for all that we know, on account of the Aryans having failed to conquer the north-eastern part of the Punjab[97] or of the Kurukshetra country,[98] where the snow-clad heights of the Himālayas must have checked their advance. There is no evidence to show that any *demon* of the 'Brāhmaṇas' was turned into a *god* in the *Avesta* or that their rituals were made "deliberately antagonistic."

[93] E.G. Browne, 'A Year amongst the Persians', p. 100.

[94] Y. V, 2, 9, Dinkaṭ VII. 4.72.

[95] Dhalla, 'Zoroastrian Theology - p. 279.

[96] The name also occurs in classical texts; cf. 'Manusmṛti,' VI. 31.

[97] The home of a large portion of the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā.

[98] Where the 'Brāhmaṇa' texts were mostly formed.

On the other hand, the rituals of the two scriptures show remarkable points of contact.[99]

If, however, one turns from a superficial to a thorough comparison of the religions of the Veda and the Avestā, one would not fail to notice a number of deep-seated agreements in their religious outlook. In point of time, the Gāthās come nearer to the late Vedic texts (particularly to the earlier Upaniṣads) than the earlier hymns of the Ṛgveda-saṁhitā. In these later Vedic texts, we find a strain of monotheism which approximates to the spirit of the Gāthās of Zarathustra. The supreme god in these texts is Prajāpati, the Creator,[100] who closely resembles Ahura Mazdā of the Avestā. The eternal clash between the powers of good and evil which we find in the Avestā from the Gāthās downwards is matched by the battle between the gods and the demons which the 'Brāhmaṇas' never tire of recounting. As in the Avestā, so in the Vedas, the powers of evil are ultimately made to 'yield to those of good'. In both the scriptures, we find a spirit of active resistance of the demons. If Zarathustra was full of so much concern for the protection of cattle (cf. Y. XXIX), so did the Vedic Aryans call the cow 'aghnyā' (="not deserving to be killed") and slaughtered her on very rare ceremonial occasions. The readers need hardly be reminded that in Hinduism veneration of the cow and preservation of her life later became an article of faith. Even human blood has been spilled without remorse for preserving the lives of cows being led out for slaughter. The veneration of the cow went so far among Hindus and Pārsīs that both the communities used her urine for ceremonial purification ! The rituals of the two peoples also, as I have remarked above, show fundamental points of agreement. That the Pārsīs substituted for the actual Soma creeper the twig of a different plant was not due to any conscious puritanism, as is sometimes assumed, but caused by the scarcity of the real Soma, which led the writers of the

---

[99] See S.K. Hodivala, 'Indo-Iranian Religion'; Lecture I, and J.J. Modi, 'The Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the Parsis,' pp. 260 ff.

[100] Or the neutral Brahman in the 'Upaniṣads'.

'Brāhmaṇas' in India also to enjoin the substitution of the 'pūtīka' or any other similar creeper when Soma could not be obtained.[101] These and many other fundamental points of contact between the Vedas and the Avestā make a hypothesis of initial Indo-Iranian religious breach unthinkable. The differences that are discernible in the religions of the two communities can be easily explained through natural development, which was necessarily different in the two cases.

Lastly, it should be borne in mind that people do not change their religions so light-heartedly as Haug assumed.[102] Religious convictions are the most rooted ones a people has, and they are very hard to shake on. People do not give up their gods unless they completely break away from their old religions and turn to altogether new creeds. Even in the case of conversion, the old ideas and practices often recur, as we find in almost every country.[103] Consequently a spiteful deliberate inversion of gods and demons could never have taken place among the Indo-Aryans and the Irano-Aryans when Zarathustra preached his message. How could either community chastise the other by making changes in its own religious notions ? This would be more foolish than cutting one's *own* nose to spite *another* man's face. All this could not be realised in 1862, when Haug propounded his theory. But since then we have made great strides in the history of religion and in the analytical study of the Veda and the Avestā. Should we be still satisfied with the antiquated assumptions of Haug ? Is it not high time that we should discard them altogether and take a more objective view of things ?

---

[101] 'Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa' IX. 5. 3, 'Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa' I. 4. 7, 'Kāṭhaka-saṁhitā' XXXIV. 3, 'Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa' XIV. 1.2.12. See A. Stein in 'B.S.O.S.', VI. p. 505.

[102] The intention of Dr. Ambedkar and his followers to change the religion of 'Harijans' on account of social and political quarrel with the Caste Hindus is not a parallel case. Here the idea is to change over completely to a *different* religion, already established, and not to make tinkerings here and tinkerings there in the Hindu religion professed by the 'Harijans' up to the present day. Such was not the case with the ancient Iranians in Haug's view. We should also remember that the peculiar political position of the 'Harijans' created by the new Government of India Act could by no chance have had any parallel among the reforming Iranians of antiquity.

[103] The Slavonic peasants of the nineteenth century, *e.g.*, worshipped many of the "pagan" deities (*e g.* 'Domovoy', mentioned above) in spite of the Christianity that they professed (Ralston, 'The Songs of the Russian People' Ch. II) and "pagan" gods masquerading as Saint This or Saint That still obtain the worship of the masses in many other countries of Christian Europe. Many of the "primitive" tribes and "Harijans" in India converted to Christianity still retain a lot of their old faiths.

## IV.

# THE TRADITIONAL DATE OF ZARATHUSTRA : IS WEST'S "CORRECTION" NECESSARY ?

Opinion is strongly divided among Iranists about the value of the traditional date of Zarathustra, the great religious reformer of Ancient Iran. Many would unceremoniously reject it on the ground of the great resemblance that his *Gāthās* bear to the language of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* which is assigned to about 1,000 B.C. or a very much earlier date. I am showing elsewhere[1] that this linguistic argument has no probative values as (1) the language of the *Gāthās* also shows many post-vedic forms, (2) it bears a more marked resemblance with the language of the Achaemenian Persians from the sixth century B.C. downwards, and (3) different dialects in different areas do not have the same rate of development. The historical arguments against the traditional date are also of no value. I am showing there that there is no real difficulty in accepting the traditional date. It is hard to understand why the mediaeval Iranians should have invented a very late date for the founder of their religion.[2]

I am here concerned with the problem of what is actually the "traditional" date of Zarathustra. E W. West supposed that Iranian tradition gives two dates for the birth of Z., 625 B.C. according to the *Bundahish* (XXXIV, 7, 8) and 660 B.C. according to the *Zāt-sparam* (XXIII, 12) read in the light of the *Artā Vīrāf Nāmak* (I, 2-6) and he accepts the latter date. A.V.W. Jackson's acceptance of West's "correction" of the *Bundahish* date[3] gives to it great authority. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the credentials of West's evidence.

---

1. (*A.V.W, Jackson Memorial Volume*).
2. *SBE. XLVII*, pp. xxvii ff.
3. *Zoroaster*, pp. 150, 159 and 179.

Let us see what is that available evidence on the point. The *Bundahish* (XXXIV, 7-8) says :

> "Kaī-Vishtsāp, till the coming of the religion, thirty years, altogether a hundred and twenty years; Vohūman, son of Spenddāt a hundred and twelve years; Hūmāī, who was the daughter of Vohūman, thirty years; Dārāī, son of Cihār-zāda, that is, of the daughter of Vohūman, twelve years; Dārāī, son of Dārāī fourteen years; Alexander the Ruman fourteen years." (West's translation, *SBE*, V, pp. 150-1).

This gives an interval of 90+112+30+12+14+14=272 years between "the coming of religion" and the end of Alexander's reign (323 B.C.), *i.e.*, it places "the coming of the religion" in 595 B.C. It is obvious that the individual reigns making up the total of 272 years are mistaken. But the total must have followed a traditional reckoning current in the religious calendar. We have similar cases in Indian tradition of the totals being correct, without the individual items making up the total, being so *e.g.*, the Jaina tradition of 255 years elapsing between the accession of Chandragupta Maurya and the start of the Vikrama Era. Similarly, an era reckoned from the *Nirvāṇa* of the Buddha, seems to have been in use in India even as early as the time of Aśoka. It is easier to preserve the memory of an individual incident in a people's religious history, like the birth, the first preaching or the death of the founder of a religion, through a continuous reckoning, than to have correct and complete record of all facts of past history.

West would have us reject the tradition of 272 years between "the coming of the religion" and the death of Alexander on account of two statements in the *Selections of Zāt Sparam* (XXIII. 11-12) and the *Artā-Vīrāf Nāmak* (I. 1-2). The former says :

> "Of the six great upholders of the religion there are the two daughters of Zaratūṣt, whose names are Fréno and Srīto, *with* Aharūbo-stōtō, son of Médyomāh, and

> another three, who are Vohūman that is born in the fortieth year of the religion, Seno is *afterwards* born and passes away in the two-hundredth year, *and* as to his hundred-discipledom, it exists day and night till the three-hundredth year. Afterwards the religion is disturbed and the monarchy is contested." (West, *SBE*, XLVII, p. 166)

and the latter :

> "They say that once upon a time, the pious Zaratūsht made the religion which he had received, current in the world, and till the completion of 300 years, the religion was in purity, and men were without doubts. But afterwards the accursed Evil-spirit, the wicked one, in order to make men doubtful of this religion, instigated the accursed Alexander, the Rūman, who was welling in Egypt, so that he came to the country of Iran with severe cruelty and war and devastation, he also slew the ruler of Iran, and destroyed the metropolis and empire and made them waste." (West, *Artā Virāf*, p. 141).

These two texts appear to place an interval of exactly 300 years between "the coming of the religion" and the conquest of Persia by Alexander (331 B.C,). These two statements seem to bear a strong family resemblance to each other. Though West later[4] 'withdrew his earlier'[5] view that the *Artā-Virāf Nāmak* makes a reference to the *Dinkart*, it is quite likely that the *Artā Virāf Nāmak* is later than and based on the *Selections from Zat-Sparam*. The statement in the latter books that 3 incidents happened, one after another, exactly at intervals of 100 years, makes too great a demand on our credulity. If however, we believe that the reference to 100 years is to be interpreted as reference to centuries in round numbers, everything becomes easy. I may again cite a parallel from India. The northern Buddhists have made many references to incidents in Buddhist history in terms of centuries[6]. If we understand the statement in the *Selections from Zāt-Sparam* as meaning only centuries in round terms, we do not at all require to "correct" the definite statement in the *Bundahish.*

---

[4] *Pahlavi Literature* in *Grundriss d. iran. Philologie u. Altertumskundes*, II, p. 108.

[5] *Sitzungsberichti der philosophischen und historischen classe der k. b. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1886, I, p. 487,

If the *Bundahish* tradition is to stand, let us see what it amounts to. The "coming in of the religion" took place in 595 B.C. What is this *coming in of the religion*? Surely it cannot mean the birth of Zarathushtra. Nor is it likely that it means the conversion of Vishtāspa when Zarathushtra was 42 years of age, because Z., had begun his preaching and made converts before this. We are, therefore, left with the alternatives that it either means, (1) his going into conference with the Immortals at the age of 30 or (2) his first preaching of his religion 2 years later. The date of Zarathushtra's birth had to be accordingly placed in either (1) 625 B.C. or (2) 627 B.C. If we accept the second interpretation, taking a clue from the importance given by the Indian Buddhist tradition to the first Revolution of the Wheel of Law by Buddha at Sarnath, we come very close to the definite statement made by the Syrian scholist, Theodore bar Khoni, of about the end of the sixth century A.D. that :

> "From Zardusht to the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ are six hundred and twenty eight years and seven months." (Jackson, *Zoroastrian Studies*, pp. 249-251).

Even if we follow West in taking "the coming of the religion" as referring to Zarathushtra's Conference with the Immortals,[7] we get a date (525 B.C.) not far removed from that given by Theodore bar Khoni.

Jackson has cited a well authenticated tradition current in Persia of a cypress tree planted by Zarathushtra or Vishtāspa at Kashmir to commemorate Vishtāspa's acceptance of the Religion, which was felled by orders of the Caliph Mutawakkil in the year 861 A.D.[8] The tree is represented as having lived 1450 years. Consequently, if we are to calculate these as solar years, as we should, because the tradition was Persian and not Arabian, the tree was planted in the year 589 B.C., which would be the year of Vishtāspa's conversion when the prophet was 42 years of age. This tradition would accordingly place his birth in the year 631 B.C., which is not very different from the dates given by the *Bundahish* and Theodore bar Khoni. If, however, 1450 is to be taken as a round figure for a period between 1400 and 1500, the date of the Prophet's birth may be shifted a little this way or that way of 631 B.C., and we may have here a tradition corresponding to that in the *Bundahish* or given by Theodore bar Khoni.

---

[6] *See, e.g., Vasumitra's Origin and Doctrines of Early Buddhist Schools,* translated by I. Masuda, from the Chinese of Yuan Chwang, pp. 15 ff.

[7] *SBE,* XLVII, p. xxvii.

Under these circumstances, I suppose that we would be justified in taking 627 B.C. or *circa* 625 B.C., as the traditional date of the birth of Zarathushtra.

---

[8] *Zoroastar*, pp. 163-4; *Zoroastrian Studies*, pp. 255-56,

# CHAPTER V

## THE DATE OF ZARATHUSHTRA

[*This is an elaboration of the preceding paper adding new evidence in favour of the traditional date—Ed.*]

जनार्दनं नमस्कृत्य प्रयते कालनिर्णये ।
स्पितमान्वयजातस्य जरठोष्ट्रस्य शासितुः ॥
ईशाख्रिष्टोदयात्पूर्वं सप्तमे शतके स वै ।
प्राप्तवान् पार्थिवं जन्म व्युषिताश्वपुरोहितः ॥
इति या पारसीदेशे सम्प्रदायगता प्रथा ।
तन्निराकरणे हेतुः पुष्कलो न हि दृश्यते ॥

So much has been written on the date of the Prophet of Ancient Iran that a new treatment of the same question may appear superfluous. But no unanimity prevails among scholars on this question and the very popularity of the theme shows that the problem is difficult. West[1] and Jackson[2], following Iranian tradition as they understand it, assign to him the date of 660-583 B.C.[3], but Geldner[4], Bartholomae[5], Meyer[6], Moulton[7] and others plead for much earlier dates on grounds of general probability. Hertel has tried to prove for the period of his activity a date (558-522 B.C.) later than even what the tradition gives,[8] but his effort must be considered as unsuccessful.[9] Iranists are thus arranged in two opposing camps, one

---

1. *S.B.E.*, XLVII, pp. xxvii ff.
2. *Zoroaster*, pp. 157 ff. and *Zoroastrian Studies*, pp. 249-51, 255-66.
3. Meillet in his *Trois Conferences sur les Gāthā de l'Avesta*, pp. 21. ff. (English translation by Priyaranjan Sen, pp. 13ff)
4. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, Vol. XXI, pp. 246, 247, Vol. XXVIII, p, 1041.
5. *Zarathushtra's Leben und Lehre*, pp. 10-1 (English translation by V.S. Sukthankar in *Indo-Iranian Studies in honour of D P. Sanjana*, p. 8).
6. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, XXI, p. 2 5.
7. *Early Zoroastrianism*, pp. 17ff.
8. *Die Zeit Zoroasters*.
9. See the criticisms of Charpentier in *J.R.A.S.*, 1925, p. 734 and *B.S.O.S.*, III, pp. 747 ff. and Keith in *I.H.Q.*, I, pp. 4-17 and *Religion and Philosophy of the Vedas*, Vol. II, 614-6.

accepting the tradition and the other rejecting it for an earlier date and the two groups do not show any inclination for considering the other point of view. But science requires that we should carefully look into the nature of the tradition that Jackson and others rely on, as also examine the unusual grounds for rejecting it. The very complexity of the problem demands a thorough examination of the available evidence. I am attempting here such an enquiry, but very briefly. This has become all the more necessary on account of certain one-sided writings on this topic very recently published.

Let us begin with the Pahlavi tradition. The *Bundahish* (XXXIV, 7-8), in course of the chronology of Iranian kings from the mythological period, says :

> "Kaī-Vishtāsp[10], till the coming of the religion, thirty years, altogether a hundred and twenty years. Vohūman, son of Spend-dāt a hundred and twelve years, Hūmāī, who was daughter of Vohūman, thirty years ; Dārāi, son of Ciharāzāt, that is, of the daughter of Vohūman, twelve years : Dārāī son of Dārāī fourteen years ; Alexander the Rūman fourteen years."[11]

The context §6 shows that the years refer to the periods of reign. The meaning of "coming of the religion" is not quite clear, for it might refer to either the beginning of Zarathushtra's revelation, i.e. first conference with the Immortals, or to his return from the conference and first beginning of preaching 2 years later of or to the conversion of Vistāshpa, 10 years after that. West accepts the first view on the basis of *Dinkart* VII. 8.51.[12] The passage referred to is thus translated by him :

> "And about the separation of the ten centuries in the one millenium of Zaratūsht, *and* the tidings of Aūshadar, son of Zaratūsht, it says also this namely : 'When that century fully elapses which is the first of the religion of the Mazda-worshippers from *the time when* Zaratūsht

---

[10] To avoid confusion, I have generally changed the transliteration of the proper names in the quotations to the system generally followed.

[11] *S.B.E.*, V, pp. 150-1.

[12] *S.B.E.*, XLVII, p. xxvii.

> came forward to his conference, what is the separation of *this* first century ?' ........."[13]

I may be permitted to infer from this passage that the Pahlavi tradition reckoned the "coming of the religion" from Zarathushtra's first going into conference with the Holy immortals; but this is not absolutely certain. In any case, according to the *Bundahish* passage we are discussing, Vistāshpa reigned for 90 years after the 'coming of the religion'. Vohūman Spenddāt is said to have ruled for 112 years after him and Hūmāi and the two Dariuses for 54 years subsequently. But there is a clear mistake in the next figure, for Alexander could not have reigned for 14 years after the last Darius (305-331 B.C.) for he died only 8 years after (323 B.C.). The fourteen years must refer to the total period of Alexander's rule since his accession to the throne of Macedon (336 B.C.)[14] If we thus substitute 14 years of Alexander's reign since Darius's overthrow by the correct figure of 8 years, we get 90+112+30+12+13+8+266 years intervening between the 'coming of the religion' and the death of Alexander (323 B.C.) and not 272 years as West and Jackson suppose. Consequently the 'coming of the religion' may be placed about 589 B.C. and if Zarathustra was 30 years old at that time, he was born in the year 619 B.C.

But we cannot be quite sanguine about any of the figures. Finding that Alexander's period of reign also includes his reign before the conquest of Persia, we cannot be sure that no other mistake has been made. Vishtāspa is described as reigning for I20 years and Vohuman for 112 years. These figures look like total periods of life (real or imaginary) and not like periods of actual region, unless they represent the rules of a number of kings. If the former is the right explanation for these high figures and if no other reigns have been omitted, then the 'coming of the religion' will have to be brought down to a date much later than 589 B.C., but how much later, we have no means of deciding. The fact that in the next section the *Bundahish* makes the Arsacides rule for 284 years after

---

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[14] Even then, there is discrepancy of one year, which is, however, not serious.

Alexander, when they actually ruled for about 475 years and there was some good interval (73 years) between them and Alexander and that it makes the Sassanians rule for 460 years when they reigned for only 427 years,[15] shows how unsatisfactory is the author's knowledge of the chronology of his country's history.[16] The facts have been further distorted by the theory of milleniums which had to end with some very important incidents in the country's history.

West does not much depend on the *Bundahish* chronology. His difficulties are not those mentioned above. But he places greater reliance on the statements of the *Artā-Vīrāf Nāmak* (I. 1-5) and the *Selections from Zāt* (XXIII. 11-12) the 300 years elapsed between the 'coming of the religion' and the conquest of Alexander (331 B.C.). He deduces from this that Zarathushtra was born in the year 660 B.C., supposing that the *Bundahish* made a mistake of 35 years.[17] But have we any right to place implicit reliance on the statements of these two texts ? Let us see what they read like. Haug translates the former passage thus :

> 'They say that once upon a time, the pious Zarathusht made the religion which he had received, current in the world, and till the completion of 300 years, the religion was in purity, and men were without doubts. But afterwards the accursed Evil-spirit, the wicked one, in order to make men doubtful of this religion, instigated the accursed Alexander, the Hūman, who was dwelling in Egypt, so that he came to the country of Iran with severe cruelty and war and devastation, he

---

[15] *S.B.E.*, XLVII, p. 151. The period of Sassanian rule can, however, be increased by about 27 years, the interval between the death of Yazdigird III (651 A.D.) and that of his son Peroz in China (about 678). But there is nothing to show that Peroz ever ruled or was believed by Persians to have ruled in Persia. (See Huart, *Ancient Persian and Iranian Civilization*, pp. 137-8).

[16] Our Purāṇas show similar confusion; cf. the dynasties of the *Kali Yuga* as given in the Purāṇas with the evidence of the inscriptions and of the Pali chronicles.

[17] *S.B.E.*, XLVII, pp. xxviii ff.

> also slew the ruler of Iran, and destroyed the metropolis and empire and made them waste.'[18]

And the passage from the *Selections of Ẕāt-Sparam* reads thus in West's rendering :

> 'Of the six great upholders of the religion there are the two daughters of Zarathūsht, whose names are Frāno and Srīto, *with* Aharūbo-stoto, son of Medyomāh and another three, who *are* renowned for their religion for a hundred years, who are Vohūnām that is born in the fortieth year of the religion, Seno is *afterwards* born and passes away in the two-hundredth year, *and* as to his hundred-discipledom, it exists day and night till the three-hundredth year. Afterwards the religion is disturbed and the monarchy is contested.'[19]

Now, it appears from both the passages, particularly from the *Ẕāt-Sparam,* that 300 is only a round figure, which may stand for any figure in the third century. We have no right to assume that the three sets of events mentioned in the *Ẕāt-Sparam* occurred at the lapse of just 100, 200 and 300 years since the 'coming of the religion'. Things do not happen in life in such mathematical order. The natural explanation should be that they are to be ascribed to the first, second and third centuries since the religion. We have similar references by centuries in Buddhist annals in India.[20] According to the *Bundahish* passage referred to above the ninth millenium seems to end with the 'coming of the religion' and the tenth with the Arah conquest.[21] But if we add up the figures given in the text for the tenth millenium, we get 1016 years. Consequently these hundreds and thousands must be taken as approximate figures. We have thus no reason to suppose that the *Artā Vīrāf* and the *Ẕāt-Sparam* give precise figures or figures better than or different from the *Bundhish.* We have therefore no means for deciding from the Pahlavi texts cited above the exact year of Zarathushtra's revelation. The authors of the Pahlavi texts do not seem to have possessed full and correct historical records. Still it seems from their statements that they had some idea about the epoch in which the prophet lived, viz., somewhere in the sixth or the seventh century B.C.

---

[18] *Artā Virāf*, p. 141.

[19] *S.B.E.*, XLVII, p. 166.

[20] See, e.g., *Vasumitra's Origin and Doctrines of Early Buddhist Schools*, translated by J. Masuda from the Chinese of *Yuan Chwang*, pp. 15 ff.

[21] *S.B.E.*, V, p. 150 n. 9 and 151 n. 4.

6. Outside Pahlavi literature, there are some other traditions about Zarathushtra's date, which seem to be ultimately of Iranian origin. First of all, we have the unequivocal statement of the Syrian scholiast, Theodor bar Khoni, of about the end of the sixth century A.D., that :

> 'From Zaratusht to the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ are six hundred and twenty-eight years and seven months.'[22]

This is a very exact figure, but we have no means of adjudging its value. Jackson says that this date also refers to the 'coming of the religion, ;[23] but if 'the revelation' must refer to Christ's *birth*, so should 'From Zarathusht' mean 'from Zarathustra's birth.' Then Al Bīrūnī (973-1048), that very accurate Arab mathematician and chronologist, says in his *Chronology of Ancient Nations* (translated by Sachau, p. 17), that from Zarathushtra's 'appearance till the beginning of the era Alexanderi', the Persians 'count 258 years'. The era of Alexander seems on Al Birūni's own statement (p. 32) to start from 330 B.C. Consequently, if Zarathushtra's 'appearance' means his birth he was born, according to traditions current in Persia in Al Birūnī's time, in the year 588 B.C. If, however, it refers to his first conference with the Immortals, he was born in 618 B.C., and, if to the conversion of Vishtāshpa, then the Prophet was born in 630 B.C. It is interesting to note that the first figure almost exactly corresponds to the date given in the *Bundahis*, with my correction, and the third very nearly to Theodore bar Khoni's. Masūdī, who died 16 years before Al Bīrūnī's birth, records the same tradition.[24] Then

---

[22] Jackson, *Zoroastrian Studies*, pp. 249-51.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

[24] Jackson, *Zoroaster*, pp. 162-3.

Jackson adds a very well-authenticated tradition current in Persia of cypress tree planted by Zarathushtra or Vishtāspa at Kashmir to commemorate Vishtāspa's acceptance of the Religion, which was felled by orders of the Caliph Mutawakkil in the year 861 A.D.[25] The tree is represented as having lived 1450 years. Consequently, if we are to calculate these as solar years, as we should, becaure the tradition was Persian and not Arabian, the tree was planted in the year 589 B.C., which would be the year of Vishtāspa's conversion when the Prophet was 42 years of age. Consequently this tradition would place his birth in the year 631 B.C. If 1450 is to be taken as a round figure for a period between 1400 and 1500, then the date of the Prophet's birth is to be shifted by some years this way or that way.

Lastly, Anqueti du Perron stated

> 'That a certain religious sect that immigrated into China about A.D. 600 is evidently of Zoroastrian origin and that these believers have an era which dates approximately from B.C. 559.'[26]

I do not know how to appraise this statement, for we have no means of checking it. There is nothing to show what incident the said era sought to commemorate. If it starts from the 'coming of the religion', as Hertel wants us to believe, then Zarathushtra's birth should be placed in 589 B.C., if it refers to the conversion of Vishtāspa, then the Prophet was born in 601 B.C., and if, however, it starts from the death of the Prophet, as we have our Buddhist era from Buddha's death, then the date of Zarathushtra's birth would be 559+77=636 B.C. The last figure would come very near the date given by the *Bundahish*, with or without my correction. There are left two more possibilities about the origin of the era, (1) that it commemorates the departure of the original community from Iran or its arrival or (2) it signalises some other event. It is thus impossible to utilise this alleged Chinese evidence.

For all the uncertainties attaching to the Iranian tradition mentioned before, and their discrepancies, we cannot

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 163-4 and *Zoroastrian Studies*, 255-66.

[26] Jackson, *Zoroaster*, p. 165.

doubt that, rightly or wrongly, they point towards a date like 630 B.C., as the year when the Prophet first saw the light of the day, or, to give a more round figure, they represent him as living about 600 B.C. Let us see now if it is at all possible to accept this as the date of Zarathushtra. First of all we have to note that we would not expect priestly tradition to bring down the date of a founder of religion to recent times. If priests would change at all, they would exaggerate the antiquity of their tradition. So far as I am aware, no parallel can be cited of the dates of such prominent persons having been brought down in the tradition of their own country. It cannot be said that the Persians lowered the date on account of confusion of Zarathushtra's patron Vishtāspa with Dārayavashu's father Vishtāspa, for the Pahlavi tradition makes no such confusion.[27] It is only Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 330-400 A.D.),[28] followed by a few modern European writers who have identified the two Vishtāspas.[29] These Pahlavi writers were not full of Herodotus as European scholars are apt to be. We have thus no a-priori ground for rejecting the general indication of the Indian tradition about Zarathushtra's age.

9. Then, non-mention of Zarathushtra's name and ignorance of the Zoroastrian religion in the history of such an inquisitive and detailed writer as Herodotus (484 to about 425 B.C.) become hard to understand if the Prophet lived centuries before him. All readers of Herodotus know that anxiety he shows in recording the traditions of every nation he is describing. He has given an elaborate account of the

---

27. *Ibid.*, p. 171. See West in *S.B.E.*, XLVII, p, xxxix, for the difference between the ancestry of the historical Vishtāspa, father of Darius I, as given in the Behistun inscription, and that of Zarathushtra's patron, as given in Pahlavi tradition. There may have been some confusion about the lower end of the line, due to the Achaemenians having brought under their own rule the whole of Iran.

28. Jackson, *Zoroaster*, p. 244.

29. I wonder why Hertel and some other modern scholars want to identify the two Vishtāspas. The name is by no means unique. A number of princes of different periods have actually borne this name. We have a king named *Vyuṣitāśva* (phonetically very much like the Iranian *Vishtāspa*) in the *Mahābhārata* (Ādi Parvan, ch. 121 in Ganapati Krishnaji's edition).

religion and customs of the Persians (Bk. I, Chs. 131-140) and there was enough room for a mention of the great Prophet and his reform.[30] Herodotus knows of the gods whom the Persians have worshipped from the beginning, as also of some newly introduced deities (Ch. 1317, but nothing of the *Amesha Spentas* of whom Plutarch shows so much knowledge.[31]) He has heard only a vague echo of Magian dualism in connection with the history of the founder of the Median kingdom, Deiokes (I, 96).[32] Herodotus, we know, was a native of Halicarnassus in Caria, which was included within the empire of the Achaemenians. There and further east, in course of his extensive travels, he must have got definite informations about the Persians,[33] as is clear from Chapter 140 of the First Book, when he describes the difference between the Medians and the Persians in the disposal of the dead :

> 'So much I can say of them *of my own certain knowledge.* But there are other matters concerning the dead

---

30. Moulton says (*Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 393 n. 8) "All these are probably *urarisch.*" See also E. Benveniste, *The Persian Religion according to the chief Greek Texts, ch. II.*
31. *Isis and Osiris*, ch. 47 (Moulton's Early Zoroastrianism, p. 401).
32. In connexion with Deiokes' efforts for gaining ascendancy over his countrymen, Herodotus says that "he began to profess and practise justice more constantly and zealously than ever—*though he knew that injustice is ever the foe of justice* (Loeb translation, Vol. I, p. 127). It is often supposed that dualism is a principle first taught by Zarathushtra and learnt from him by the Jews. See M. Gaster in *E.R.E*, Vol., IX, pp. 637-40 for a not very successful refutation of the latter view and the recent elaborate study of Langdon in J.R.A.S., 1934, pp. 45-56. Langdon has proved that there was enough of "cosmological dualism" in Babylonia from which the Hebrews imbibed a lot. It appears from the facts arrayed by Langdon that the Iranians themselves learnt their dualism from the same source, though he does not say anything on the point. The influence of Sumero-Babylonian demonology was widely diffused and the Medians may easily have learnt from the Assyrian neighbours lessons on this subject as on many others. Zarathushtra seems to have given an ethical bias to the current notions about dualism, incalculating that 'evil' should be opposed and not acquiesced in (*Yas.* 30 etc.). In his scheme 'good' is to have ultimate victory.
33. But Benveniste wants to suggest that he had been in Persia (*op. cit.*, p. 22).

> which are secretly and obscurely told—how the dead bodies of Persians are not buried before they have been mangled by bird or dog. That is the way of the Kagians, I know for a certainty; for they do not conceal the practice. But this is certain that before the Persians bury the body in earth they embalm it in wax. (Loeb)[34]

Consequently his ignorance of Zarathushtra or anything definitely Zoroastrain seems difficult to explain if the Prophet had preached this religion long ago. If, on the other hand, he had preached his message in Bactria only a century or so ago, we can easily account for its having not yet reached Caria or Mesopotamia.

One may here object that other Greek (and Roman) writers mention Zarathushtra and place him in a hoary antiquity—5000 years before the Trojan War or 6000 years before Xerxes or Plato or Alexander. It is believed that these traditions place Zarathushtra at least several centuries before the contact of the Greeks with the Persians. But let us carefully examine this evidence. The earliest of these writers is believed to be the Lydian historian Xanthus, who is said to have been a contemporary of Artaxerxes I (465-424 B.C.).[35] Unfortunately his original work is now lost; we have only a few fragments preserved by later writers. Of these, two refer to Zarathushtra, one preserved by Nikolaus of Damascus (1st century B.C.)

---

34. This shows that Herodotus had not been in Persia proper; for if he had been, he would have had occasions to see Persian funerals with his own eyes. Deaths would be few in foreign lands, because there would be few Persians living there. Exposure of the dead, though taught in the Younger Avesta, seems originally to have been a Magian (median) practice.

35. Jackson, *Zoroaster*, p. 232 and Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 412, who refer to Wilhelm von Christ's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. See also the classical authorities cited by Philip Smith for Xanthus' date in William Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Bibliography and Mythology*, 1858, Vol. III, p. 1287. It appears from Strabo's language in his *Geography* (Bk. I, ch. 3, 4) that Xanthus saw with his own eyes the effects of the great drought that occurred in the time of Artaxerxes.

and the other by Diogenes Laertius (2nd or 3rd century A.D.)[36] The former only mentions Zarathushtra and assigns to him some teachings like prohibition against polluting fire by burning dead bodies or other impure substances.[37] Consequently this is useless for our purpose. All that it proves is that Xanthus, who seems to have penetrated into Persia proper, had there heard of Zarathushtra to whom the Magians had already begun to ascribe some of their own doctrines as in the Later Avesta. Nothing is said about date...Diogenes, on the other hand, names Xanthus only for Zarathushtra's date :

> 'The date of the Magians, beginning with Zoroaster the Persian, was 5000 years before the fall of Troy, as given by Hermodorus the Platonist in his work on mathematics; but Xanthus the Lydian reckons 6000 years from Zoroaster to the expedition of Xerxes, and after that event he places a long line of Magians in succession, bearing the names of Ostanes, Astrampsyhos, Gobryas and Pazatas, down to the conquest of Persia by Alexander.'[38]

Moulton wishes to read, on the authority of some manuscripts, hexakosia (600 years) in the place of hexakiskhilia (6000 years) of the text and claims this as placing Zarathushtra just where he would have him on other grounds.[39] But the Paris Didot edition accepts the reading 6000 years and so does the editor of the Loeb text (Ip. 4). Certainly an editor of Diogenes, who has only to proceed on the evidence of that mss and has no theory to prove, has certainly a better claim to be heard in such matter than an interested person like Moulton. Consequently the alleged quotation from Xanthus in Diogenes assigns to Zarathushtra the same impossible antiquity as Pliny, Plutarch and similar writers. Then the genuineness of this quotation is impugned by its very words : Diogenes makes

---

[36] Jackson, *Zoroaster*, pp. 232 and 241-2.

[37] This seems to be Magian and not a Zarathustrian teaching, if we are to follow Moulton.

[38] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Prologue I 2 Loeb Classics, Vol. I, p. 5).

[39] *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 412.

Xanthus refer also to the conquest of Persia by Alexander,[40] when the historian must have been dead for about one hundred years.' This shows what a careless writer Diogenes was[41] and what value we should attach generally to these alleged quotations from Xanthus the Lydian.'[42] Consequently we are left with only the quotation in Nikolaus, if this also is not of the same nature as the passage in Diogenes, but it only names the Prophet and suggests that he lived some time ago, and does not give his date. The author of the Alkibiades I (122 A) mentions the Magianism of Zoroaster, the son (*sic.*') of Oromazus (= Ahura Mazda)', in which one of the four teachers of a Persian Prince is said to have instructed him.[43] The author was probably not Plato but perhaps some contemporary of his (middle of the 4th century B.C.)[44] Here also we have no mention of date. It is only the last scholiast who places Zarathushtra 6000 years before Plato[45] and his source seems to have been the late authorities like Pliny or Plutarch. It is possible that Plato had some knowledge of Zoroastrian (or Magian ?) dualism[46] but we cannot be sure. 'But whether Aristotle wrote a dialogue 'On Philosophy' and mentioned the Magian doctrine of dualism of clash between Ahura Mazda and Anra Mainyu as Diogenes asserts (I.8) is by no means certain because of the carelessness of Diogenes pointed out above. In any case, neither Plato nor Aristotle seems to have

---

40. The Greek original makes it plain that this statement is also ascribed to Xanthus.
41. See Hick's remarks about our author's carelessness in his Introduction to the Loeb edition, pp. xv-xvi.
42. Cf. Philip Smith in Smith's *Dictionary*, *loc.cit.*, "It is certain that much of the matter in the extant fragments is spurious; and the probability appears to be that the work from which they are taken is the production of an Alexandrian grammarian, founded upon the genuine work of Xanthus."
43. *The Dialogues of Plato*, translated by Jowett, 3rd ed., Vol. II, p. 488.
44. Jackson, *Zoroaster*, p. 231, Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, p. 424 n. 2, Jowett, *op. cit.*, pp. 428-30, A.E. Taylor, *Plato*, pp. 12-3. But Benveniste (*op. cit.*, p. 16) accepts the work as Plato's.
45. Bekker's Berlin edition (1823), Commentaries Vol. II, p. 318 and Jackson, *op. cit.*
46. Moulton, E.Z., p. 419.

named Zarathushtra. Consequently Xanthus is the only classical writer of a pre-Christian era about whose reference to our Prophet we can have any confidence. Having been in Persia proper, he may have heard of Zarathushtra, though his contemporary, Herodotus, who probably did not go to the east of Mesopotamia, did not hear of the Prophet. If Xanthus was a contemporary of Artaxerxes I, this can very easily be understood, for the Pahlavi tradition seems to know him as first king to spread Zoroastrianism beyond its original limited area.[47] The high antiquity assigned to Zarathushtra by Pliny, Plutarch and other post-Christian writers[48] has been adequately explained by Jackson[49] as due to a misunderstanding of the Iranian theory of millenial cycles, according to which Zarathushtra's *fravaši* was formed 6000 years before he had his revelation.[50] It is not known definitely when this theory was formed but it may well have come in by the time of the later Achaemenians. The word *fravashi* we find in the form of *Fravartish* as the names of two Medians, the father and the son of the Median king Deiokes (708-655 B.C.) but we do not know the exact connotation of the word in the eighth and seventh centuries before

---

[47] See *Bahman Yasht*, II. 17 : "And that (age) which was of silver is the reign of Arṭashīr the Kayān, whom they call Vohūman, son of Spend-dāṭ who is he who separates the demons from men, scatters *them* about and makes the religion current in the whole world." (*S.B.E.*, Vol. V, pp. 198-9). It is usual to identify Kaī Arṭashīr with Artaxerxes I (*ibid.*, p. 198 n. 5) but the long reign given in the *Bundahish* (xxxiv, 7) for Vohūman, son of Spend-dāt, with whom the *Bahman Yasht* identifies him may represent the reigns of Artaxerxes II, Sogdianus, Darius II and Artaxerxes II, about 106 years, not much different from the figures given in the *Bundahish* (112 years). It is in this period that the Achaemenian inscriptions begin to reflect the syncretic religion of the Younger Avesta. The politically uneventful reign of Artaxerxes I (Huart, *Ancient Persia and Iranian Civilization*, 64) may have been spent in the assimilation and propagation of the new faith. He does not seem to have left any inscription in any monument beyond the small Babylonian inscription in the house he built at Persepolis (Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften du Achaemeniden*, p. 121).

[48] Jackson, *Zoroaster*, pp. 153-4.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 152. See also West in *S.B.E.*, XLVII, pp. xxxix-xli.

[50] *S.B.E.*, XLVII, p. xxviii.

Christ. But that the *Younger Avesta* knows of the *Fravaśis* is absolutely certain, for we have a regular *Farvardin* Yast (XIII) there. We have perhaps the germ of the theory of Zarathushtra's *fravaśi* incarnating long before his actual birth in the *Gāthās* themselves; cf. Yas. 44, 11 where Zarathushtra speaks of his having been ordained by Ahura Mazda at the beginning (*azem töiāiś paouruyé fravoivīdē*).[51]

We have thus no reasons for pushing back Zarathushtra beyond the 6th or the 7th centuries B.C., on account of the references in Greek and Roman writers. Let us see now if there are any other objections against the traditional date, which have greater force. It is said that names like *mashdaku* and *Assara-Mazaś* figuring in Assyrian inscriptions in the eighth and seventh centuries before Christ, prove that the Mazda-worshipping religion of Zarathushtra had long come in.[52] But let us examine these facts closely. The great Assyrian king Sargon extended his rule in all directions, including Median territory in the east, and received between 715-713 B.C. tributes from numerous Median town-princes, one of them called *Mashdaku* and another *Mashtakku*(both=Maždaku=Mazdaka).[53] Mazdaka is certainly a theophoric name formed from *Mazda*, like *Vāsudevaka* and *Arjunaka* formed in Sanskrit according to Pāṇini A. 4.3.98 from *Vāsudeva* and Arjuna in the sense of 'attached to,' which we can readily recognise as the Mazda or Mazda Ahura or Ahura Mazda, whom Zarathushtra and the followers worshipped. Meyer says in this connexion : 'Now this name was the invention of Zoroaster himself; and he who names himself after Mazda thereby makes a confession of faith in the religion of Zoroaster whose followers, as we know, termed themselves Mazdayasna 'worshippers of Mazda.' Thus, if the doctrine of Zoroaster predominated in Media in 714 B.C. obviously his appearance in the role of prophet must have been much earlier.'[54] The view that Zarathushtra invented the name Mazda, though quite common, is without any foundation. But before examining that question let us analyse the fact of the mention of Assara-Mazaś, Ahura Mazda, because it has an important bearing on the significance of the name Mazdaka. It is well known that Ashurbanipal (668-626 B.C.) had collected two splendid libraries at Nineveh.[55] In one of these has been found a tablet, containing a list of gods, foreign and native, among them figuring ilu As-sa-ra (*Assara*) and ilu Maza-aś. (*Mazas*) immediately before the seven *Igigi* and the seven Anunnaki. [56] This has been hailed enthusiastically as making reference to the definitely Zoroastrian Ahura Mazda with the seven Archangels and the seven Archfiends.[57] It should be noticed that *Assara* and Mazaś are given here as two distinct words, with the determinative of a god, *ilu*, added to each. We have still no difficulty in recognising them as equivalent to Ahura (=Skt. *asura*) and *Mazdāh* (=Skt.medhas). The words *Ahura* and Mazdāh appear throughout the Avesta, unlike the Achaemenian inscriptions and Pahlavi literature, as two distinct words, which are inflected separately, and in the *Gāthās* of Zarathushtra their order is more often reversed and often only one of the names (generally Mazdāh) occurs. But still we cannot say that *Assara* Mazaś refer to *Zarathushtra's* Ahura Mazdā, because of the dental sibilant in the first word, coming nearer to the Aryan *asura*, which has already become *ahura* in the *Gāthās* of Zarathushtra. It is well known that Aryan *s* becomes *h* in the Avesta, except in combination with certain consonants.[58] The late Professor Andreas of Goettingen has thrown doubts over the exact phonetic value of a number of Gāthic signs but even he has not doubted the *h* sound in ahura. Consequently the word *Assara* tells its own history, it is phonetically pre-Zarathushtrian and it is not possible to explain away the fact.[59] When *Assara* ceases to be Zoroastrian, *Mazdāh* occurring by its side, also does Besides, it comes half way between *mazdāh* and its Indian equivalent *medhas*, with the final sibilant preserved, unlike the Avestan language, which altered it to *h* as in the case of *asura*.[60] It is true that we do not know the exact age of the names *Assara* and *Mazaś*[61], because the Assyrians, and Ashurbanipal in particular, used to copy many old texts. We get only the lower limit (7th century B. C.) (Olmstedd's attempt at late dating cannot be said to be convincing). But we cannot get away from the fact that *Assara* (later *Ahura*)and *Mazaś* (later *Mazda*) or their exact Iranian (Median ?) equivalents were in use as divine names before the time of Zarathushtra. The exigencies of the cuneiform syllabary must be responsible for some alteration in the vast Iranian sounds but that would not explain the substitution of *h* by original *s* in *Assara* and *Mazaś*. A foreign tongue can be expected to alter only such sounds as it does not possess or its script cannot represent ; and certainly h is not repugnant to the Assyrian language or its script (though Babylonians did not have exactly h, they had a near ḥ'. The modification of the final dental sibilant into s in *Mazas* is on a par with the Babylonian representations of certain Kassite names, human and divine, *Gandaś*, *Shuriaaś*, *Maruttaś* etc.

---

[51] Benveniste supposes (*op. cit.*, 16 ff.) that the conception of Zarathustra's birth 6000 years before Plato rose in the heart of the Academy. But this is extremely improbable.

[52] Meyer, *Kuhns Zeitschrift*, XLII, p. 16, *Encl. Brit.*, XXI, 205, Bartholomae, *Zarathushtras Leben und Lehre*, pp. 10-11, Charpentier, B.S.O.S., III, 752-3.

[53] Hommel, *Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients*, p. 198 n. 1, Meyer, *Encl. Brit.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 203, 205. Charpentier, *loc. cit.*

---

[54] *Encl. Brit.*, *op. cit.*, 205.

[55] Cambridge Ancient History, III, p. 88 *et passim*.

[56] Hommel, *op.cit.*, p. 30 n. 1 and pp. 204ff.

[57] Cambridge History of India, I, p. 76.

[58] "Original *s* remains in Avesta before initial *k*, *c*, *t*, *p*, *n*; or internal before the same letters when it is preceded by *a*, *a*, *ā*,"—Jackson's *Avesta Grammar* § 109. For original *s* changing into *h*, see *ibid*, §§110ff. (§114, Old *as*=av. *ah*-, generally before *u*, *ū* and their strengthening

---

——Av. *ahurem* 'Ahura, Lord' Skt. *ásuram*). See also Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, § 86.

59. It cannot be said that *assara* comes from an Iranian dialect later in the age than the *Gāthās* but still preserving the sibilant; for no such word is known to have existed. All the ancient Iranian dialects of which we have any knowledge show the mutation of *s* to *h*.

60. The Avestic stem was both *mazdāh* and *mazdā*. See Jackson's *Avesta Grammar*, § 356 and Sten Konow's paper "*Medā* and *Mazdā*" in the forthcoming *Gangānātha Jhā Commemoration Volume*. In Sanskrit also two forms of the same stem occur, *medhas* and *medhā*.

61. Hommel believes that they come from the Kassites (*op .cit.*, pp. 204-5) but there is not the least evidence for this.

So the contention that the name *Mazdaka* of the 8th century must be post-Zarthushtrian is without any warrant. All apart from the linguistic grounds adduced above, there are other reasons for doubting if Zarathushtra is to be made responsible for the name *Mazda* or *Ahura Mazda*. But before entering into them, let me note that if Sargon received tributes from Medians named *Mazdaka*, he also led into exile another, named Daiukku (Daevaka or Devaka).[62] We also know from Herodotus (I, Chs. 96-102) of a Deiokes, who founded the Median kingdom about 609 B.C.[63] We have thus at this time Iranians named not only after *Mazda* but also after *Daeva*. Zarathushtra, we know, has begun to look down upon the *Daevas* in his *Gāthās* (Ys. 30, 6 etc.) and in the *Younger Avesta* they actually become 'demons'. Consequently the names *Daiukku* and Deioks totally nullify the effect of *Masdaku* or *Mastakku*. We have no right to suppose on *a priori* grounds that the divine name *mazda* was not known in Iran before Zarathushtra. When a founder of a religion preaches his new doctrines, does he give a new name to his god? So far as I am aware, no instance can be shown of such a phenomenon. A religion is preached for being followed by people and men would normally have a prejudice against a newly invented name for the deity to be worshipped. It is all quite true that the Zoroastrians have known their religion as *Mazda-worshipping*, '*daenā māzdayasnī*,' as Ys. 9, 86 puts it but the Vendidad (II. 1 ff.) also names it *daenā āhuirī* and certainly *Ahura—Asura* was no new name for a divinity, as we know on Ṛgvedic evidence. The adjectives *mazdayasnī* and *āhuiri* seem to give a contrast with *daena worshipping* creeds. Raja Rammohan Roy brought in modern India a religious reform which has some resemblance with the reform inaugurated in Iran by Zarathushtra and he named his religion *Brahma Dharma*. But can anybody say that *Brahman* as a name of God was not known in India before the foundation of the Brahmo Samaj? Like Rammohan Roy, Zarathustra could have used a term for the Deity which was already current and

[62] Cambridge Ancient History, III, p. 52.

[63] I feel tempted to identify him with *Daiukku*, in spite of C.A.H., Vol. III, p. 51 n. 1.

against which he had no objection or which he found best suited for conveying just those qualities of the godhead for which he stood. If he had brought about an innovation in the *name* of the Deity, we would have expected him to sermonise on this point in the *Gāthās*, as he did on those points in which he had somethings new to say (cf. *Kaś.* 31, 32 and 45), or the later Avesta to make up for the deficiency. Neither the name of God nor his oneness is preached by Zarathushtra : he seems to take both for granted. Muhammad, who preached a monotheistic religion among a polytheistie people, lost no opportunity of emphasising Lā'ilāha illa-'llāh ("There is no god but God") and even his name for God Allāh was no innovation.[64] Besides, Zarathushtra does not seem to confine himself to only one name of God Mazdāh, but has also called him by ever so many endearing names, Asha, etc., which look more like aspects of God himself[65] than as names of distinct deities or angels. Speaking of *asha*, conception of which is at least as fundamental in the religion of Zarathushtra as that of *Mazdāh*, it is fair to remember that we have a whole host of names of Aryan princes in various parts of Western Asia in the Amarna period, Artatama, etc., formed from *arta ṛta—asha*. One may as well draw the same inference from such names as from *Mazdaka* or *Assara-Mazash*, that Zarathustra had already preached his religion before the fifteenth century before Christ. Few Iranists will be able now to subscribe to such a date. What is then the reason for showing a special consideration to the names *Mazdaka* and *Assara Mazaś* ?

Before taking final leave of *Assara-Mazaś*, let us examine a claim sometimes made that the context shows that Ahura

---

[64] Allāh was the name of the Great God in pre-Islamic days; see Noeldeke in *ERE*, Vol. I, p. 664 *b*. In the feminine form, *Alilat* or *Al Ilat*, we can trace the name up to Herodotus (III. 8).

[65] The grammatical enquiry of Miss Maria Wilkins Smith (*Studies in the Syntax of the Gāthās of Zarathushtra*, Philadelphia, 1929, §§ 15 ff.) shows that *mazdah*, *asha* etc. have been used as aspects of Ahura Mazda, meaning both qualities and the person possessing them — through the principle known to the Sanskritists as *guṇa-guṇinor abhedaḥ*. ('non-difference of the quality and its possessor').

Mazda is named with the Seven Archangels and the Seven Archfiends, which is a characteristic Zoroastrian combination.[66] But the context shows no such thing : the *Igigi* and the *Anunnaki* are native Assyrian gods and have nothing in common with the Zoroastrian Archangels or Archfiends. The *Igigi* are "gods of the upper world" and the *Anunnaki* "gods of the lower world"[67]. It is wrong to understand the Anunnaki as "bad spirits" (Hommel—"boese Geister"). They are just the same kind of gods as any other in the Babylo-Assyrian pantheon.[68] The number of the *Igigi* and the *Anunnaki* is generally not fixed. In Asurbanipal's inscription they are not mentioned as 7 each. We do come across this as the number of the *Igīgi* in some Assyrian inscriptions.[69] The Babylonians believed, besides, in *Seven Demons*, distinct from the *Igigi* and the *Anunnaki.*[70] Consequently there is no correspondence between the *Igigi* and *Anunnaki* on one side and the Archangels and Archfiends on the other. The number of Zoroastrian Aməsha Spentas, excluding Ahura Mazda, was added to the number only later[71] and I have already remarked

---

66. *C.H.I.*, Vol. I, p. 76.

67. Langdon, *Semitic Mythology*, p. 94 *et passim*, Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyriya*, pp. 184-7. Hrozny, *Mythen von dem Gotte Ninrag*, 84 sqq., regards the Anunnaki as cloud gods, personifying the Black Clouds as over against the White Clouds which are the Igigi; but this is too imaginative and even this does not make the Anunnaki demons.

68. Evil Spirits were exorcised in the name of the Anunnaki ("By the Anunnaki, the great gods, mayest thou be exorcised'?—Thompson, *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, Vol. I, p. 69). Consequently the Anunnaki cannot themselves be demons, nor can they be taken as in any way corresponding to the Archfiends of the later Avesta and the Pahlavi literature.

69. See Jastrow, *op.cit.*, p. 185, "The 'Igigi' are at times designated as the seven gods, but this number is simply an indication of their constituting a large group. Seven is a round number which marked a large quantity."

70. See Thompson, *op.cit.*, pp. 63, 65, 69 etc. and Langdon in J.R.A.S., 1934, pp. 50 ff.

71. Jackson, *Zoroastrian Studies*, pp. 44-46, Gray, *The Foundations of Iranian Religions*, p. 18.

that it is highly doubtful if Asha etc. in the *Gāthās* are individual entities, outside the personality of Ahura Mazda. We have also no reason for believing that the earlier Avesta knew of the Archangels as opposed by an equal number of Archfiends ; the idea belongs to the Pahlavi period. We can trace here, as in the case of the later number of 7, Babylo-Assyrian influence. We have thus no reasons for believing that we can recognise in the *Igigi* and the *Anunnaki* mentioned after *Assara* and *Mazash* in Asurbanipal's tablet, the seven Archangels and the seven Archfiends of Zoroastrian theology.

There is thus no evidence from the Assyrian side of Zarathushtra's religion having already come in. The indications are rather in the opposite direction. The words *daiva* (the much hated *daeva* of Avestan times), *asura* and *mazdas* were still being promiscuously used in north-western Iran in the eighth century B.C., as divine names, in phonetic forms that are even pre-Gāthic. That the Achaemenians were already worshipping Auramazda proves nothing, for they date from the sixth century B.C., i.e. one century after Zarathushtra comes in, according to his traditional date as we have understood it. We have also no reasons, as we have seen above. for tracing Auramazda to Zarathushtra's reform. Even if the Achaemenians are taken to be Zoroastrians,[72] the traditional date of the Prophet will not be affected.

---

[72] We cannot say this definitely about the earlier Achaemenians. The extension of the Achaemenian empire over all parts of Iran from the time of Darius I, may have slowly helped in the westward diffusion of a religion originally confined to the Bactrian region. There is no clear evidence about Darius's being a Zoroastrian. The attempts of Tolman (*Cuneiform Supplement*, (Preface, p.v.) and Herzfeld (*Archaeological History of Iran*, pp. 41 ff.) to show influence of the Avesta in his inscriptions are extremely unconvincing. With Darius Auramazda was the greatest god and not the only god. We now know from the recently discovered inscription at Persepolis that he opposed Daiva-worship and worshipped "Ahuramazda" together with "Ṛtam the exalted", which suggests that he was a Zoroastrian. He would be the first Achaemenian king whom we can definitely accept as following the faith of Zarathustra. Artaxerxes II and Artaxerses III were certainly Zoroastrians but of the syncretic type reflected in the Younger Avesta.

We may now move further to the east and see if there are any real difficulties from the Indian side against the date of c. 600 B.C. for Zarathushtra. Scholars who reject the traditional date as too low say that the agreements between the language of the *Avesta,* particularly of the *Gāthās* of Zarathushtra, and of the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā*, makes it extremely difficult to remove him far from the Vedic period and as the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā* cannot be assigned to a date later than I200-1000 B.C., we should place Zarathushtra in the vicinity of 1000 B.C. Geldner, who was both a Vedic and an Avestan scholar, was also of the same opinion[73] and certainly he has a claim to be heard. Still I have reasons to believe that the agreements between the two languages has been exaggerated. There are points in which the *Gāthās* show greater agreements with classical Sanskrit than with Vedic and they also show developments which we find only in the Prakrits. Limitations of space forbid an elaborate proof of my statement and a brief examination will not produce any effect. I shall here make only a few general observations on the cogency of the linguistic argument in such matters. Persons who use this argument forget that languages belonging to the same family but spoken in different areas can and generally do change at different rates. Sometime, the same language changes quickly in the homeland but remains practically unaltered in a distant colony. Those who want to place the Vedas and the Avesta in the same period on account of the antique character of the language of the latter, should not forget the case of Lithuanian. Lithuanian is of all the Indo-European languages spoken today the most antique in character. It has a rich inflection like ancient Sanskrit and it still preserves the musical accent of the *Vedas* and of ancient Greek. A few short sentences can be composed in Lithuanian, which would be practically identical with the corresponding sentences in Sanskrit, e.g., tāvas (fem.*tavá*) *dēvas mānas* fem.*manā*) *dévas ésti* in Lithuanian=*tava*

---

[73] *Encl. Brit.*, XXI, p. 247.

*devas mama devas asti* in Sanskrit.[74] Lithuanian also shows much agreement with ancient Iranian vocabulary.[75] But can we remove Girénas or Kurschat or Donalitus or our contemporaries on the Baltic shore to the times of Pāṇini and Zarathushtra. In this point Lithuanian does not stand alone : some of the other Balto-Slavic Languages, Russian for example, show many antique forms which have long disappeared in India, since the time of the Prakrits. The Assyro-Babylonian Language was used in inscriptions from 3000 B.C. to 100 A.D.[76] and changed very little during this very long period. Modern Arabic, which has been called "the Lithuanian, if not the Sanskrit, among Semitic languages" has not materially altered since the 5th century A.D. and modern Persian also has not much changed since the 8th century.[77] The Spanish language that is now spoken in Central America agrees more with sixteenth century Spanish than with the language spoken in Spain today[78] and we have a similar phenomenon in Siebenbuergen in Hungary, where sixteenth century German is spoken today.[79] Coming to India we find the Urdu of Hyderabad, commonly known as Dakkani, agreeing not with the present-day Urdu of North India but with the language that was spoken at Delhi in the fifteenth century. Similarly we find different dialects of the same language, Eastern Hindi and Western Hindi, Eastern Bengali and Western Bengali, for example, in different stages of development. To take an instance from ancient India, the different dialects of Aśoka's inscriptions show different degrees of Prakritic development. Some of them show antique forms that are not found in the others.[80] But all these dialects are contemporaneous. If one keeps these *facts* in mind, does it not become difficult for one to dogmatise about the rates of development of the Vedic and Avestic languages?

---

[74] *Sandhi* is omitted in the Sanskrit version for the facility of comparison.

[75] This is true of Balto-Slavic languages in general. They seem to have branched off from some Iranian or closely related dialect of antiquity—see Charpentier in *B.S.O.S.* IV, 169.

[76] A.B. Mercer, Assyrian Grammar, p. 1.

[77] I have the authority of Prof. Siddiqi for both these statements.

[78] *C H.I.*, Vol. I, p. 75.

[79] I have this information from our Ex German teacher at the University Dr. Paul Thieme.

It should not be also forgotten that the *Avesta*, including the *Gāthās*, has more in common with the language of the Ancient Persian inscriptions than with the Vedas. Geldner, who uses the argument of the agreement between Vedic and Avestic languages, for dating Zarathushtra as early as the fourteenth century B.C., gives away his whole case when he says about the language of the latest inscriptions in Ancient Persian that "on the whole it is almost as antique as Zend (i.e. Avestan), with which it has many points in common".[81] *Argumentum ad hominem* can have no place in science. But is it not significant that the author of the *Grammaire du Vieux Perse* is quite prepared to place Zarathushtra only a century before the earliest Ancient Persian inscriptions ?[82] Meillet says that in spite of their general antique character, the *Gāthās*, occasionally do show late forms and indications that the language was fast changing to a new state.[83]

We should also remember that verses generally preserve a more antique language than contemporary prose. A student of Pali literature would be at once reminded of the marked difference between the language of the *gāthās* and of the prose in whose midst they occur. In contemporary Bengali poems will be found many words and inflections that have long died out in prose. Similar phenomena are found in the poetical literatures of other countries. There is also one point to note about many of the so-called early forms in the *Gāthās* as well as the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā* that exigencies of metre make the authors take liberties with the language, chiefly in the direction of analogical formations. We thus find *janāḥ* and *janāsā*, *devaiḥ* and *devebhiḥ*, etc., used side by side in the same verse in the latter text. Primitive Indo-European instrumental plural termination—*ois*[84] of *o* stems (Sanskrit *a* stems) shows that Vedic *devebhiḥ* is an analogical formation and is not necessarily earlier than classical *devaiḥ*.[85] When the Prakrits show *devehi* etc., they are not going back to old forms but are using the same simplifying process of analogy. In classical Sanskrit verse we do not find any liberties taken with the language, even in poetry, because the language is *fixed* and rules of grammar are strictly adhered to. But in the *Purāṇas* and in similar *ārṣa* literature and in the *gāthā* of Mahāyāna Sanskrit literature we have plenty of liberty taken with the language and few would agree to take them as pre-Pāṇinean. I wonder why all this is forgotten when scholars pronounce on the age of the *Gāthās* of Zarathushtra. Such agreement that really does exist between the Vedas and the *Gāthās* proves nothing about the latter's age.

---

[80] See Hultzsch, *Inscriptions of Asoka*, Introduction, lxxxiv ff., and Woolner, *Aśoka and Glossary*, Part I, Introduction, xx. Girnar also has its own antique features.

[81] *Encl. Brit.*, XXI, p. 247*b*.

[82] See Meillet's *Trois Conferences sur les Gatha de l'Avesta*. 27-32.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 30; see also Meillet in *Journal Asiatique*, 11th series, Vol. X, pp. 183-95.

It may be said here that I contradict myself when I use linguistic evidence for making *Assaru-Manas* pre-Zarathustrian and reject it for deciding the age of the *Gāthās*. But really there is no contradiction. I do believe in the possibility of using linguistic evidence for deciding age, if the data belong to the same country and the same locality. But in the case of the *Gāthās* and the *Vedas*, they belong to different languages.

---

[84] Brugmann, *Camparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages* (English translation), Vol. III. 379.

[85] So far as the instrumental singular of *a* stems is concerned, Sanskrit has abandoned the *ā* termination of primitive I.-E. and has a new ending -*ena*, on the analogy of the pronominal declension (*ibid*., : 275, 421). This is true of the Vedic language as well; the very few instrumentals of *a* stems with the -*ā* termination, like *mahitvanā* of *ṚV*. I. 85.7 (Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, Grundriss, (372 I. 2) are exceptions and they look more like analogical reformations than as survivals. But when the *Gāthās* show the -*ā* termination, as the normal phenomenon, they are not agreeing with the Vedas but with the other I-E languages.

Remembering the facts of different languages or dialects developing at different rates in different countries, mentioned above, how can I come to any sanguine results in the case of the *Gāthās* and the *Vedas*, particularly when I find the former agreeing also with classical Sanskrit and more so with Ancient Persian ?

It will perhaps not be out of place here to mention my view about the age of the Vedas. I take their composition to have spread over a long period, from about 2000 B.C. at about 1000 B.C. or even later. It is not right to assume that the whole of the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā*, whichc ertainly contains the oldest Vedic texts, but is not wanting in late matter either, to have been completed before the other Vedas came into existence. Its latest portions come down to the very close of the Vedic period. It is thus more a library than a single book. There are hymns in the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā* which can on various grounds be placed in a very late period but even they show old forms.[86] Continuity of hieratic or bardic tradition preserves many old forms and in religious texts antique forms are generally preferred. It cannot be said that Zarathushtra had no priestly tradition to set the form of his religious poetry for he mentions the *kavis* and *uśiks* (*Ys.* 44,20 etc.), corresponding to the *kavi* and *uśij* of the Vedas. We also know from Herodotus that in the Persian sacrifice, seemingly unaffected by Zarathushtra's reform, "a Magian comes near and chants over it (the victim) the song of the birth of the gods, as the Persian tradition relates it."[87] This *theogony* seems to have been of the same character as some of our Ṛgvedic hymns : cf. *yo jāta eva prathamo manasvān devo devān kratunā paryabhūṣat*, etc., II. 12.1 ff. Consequently the antique character of the Gāthic verse does not warrant us to give to it the same antiquity as the earlier portion of the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā*.

[86] E.G. VII. 33 which has been recognised as a late hymn (Arnold, *Vedic Metre*, p. 279, Oldenberg. *Ṛgveda, textkrstische und exegetischen Noten*, II. p. 31) but its forms are on a par with the other hymns of the Seventh Maṇḍala.

[87] *Bk. I.*, ch. 135, Loeb translation.

We have thus no unimpeachable evidence for placing Zarathushtra in a period earlier than the seventh century before Christ. It is, of course, possible that the Pahlavi tradition is wholly wrong and the Prophet lived long before this period, but there is as yet no evidence for such a view. I have shown above that the grounds that have been urged so far for rejecting the traditional date are all unsatisfactory. If the tradition is to be set aside, this must be done on some new evidence, which is free from the defects pointed out above. But so long as such an evidence is not forthcoming,[88] we should agree to place the Prophet of Ancient Iran somewhere between the seventh and the sixth centuries before the Christian era. A more exact dating seems at present impossible.

[*Note*—Pt. Chattopadhyāya wrote three papers on the date of Zarathustra not at one time, each time he improved upon his arguments. All these papers have been reproduced here as they were written, so that the improvements could be understood properly—ed.]

---

[88] We must await with nervous expectation the decipherment and publication of the newly discovered records in the palace at Persepolis (J.R.A.S., 1934, pp. 231-2 and Roland Kent, *J.A.O.S.*, 1936, pp. 212-213) for some informations. Among them Herzfold's translation (pp. 213-4) of the very important inscription of Xerxes, referred to in note 72 above, has been hailed in America as proving "that the Zoroastrian faith was of recent origin" (p. 214).

# CHAPTER VI

## THE RELIGIOUS REFORM OF ZARATHUSHTRA

महासुरं नमस्कृत्य मेधसा लोकधारकम् ।
संस्कारो धार्मिकः कीदृग् जरठोष्ट्रस्य दर्श्यते ॥१॥
एकनिष्ठस्य भक्तस्य केवलमृतसेविनः ।
हिंसाद्यनृतकर्मभ्यो जुगुप्सा परमा स्थिता ॥२॥
गवां रक्षा हि कर्तव्या न हिंसेति मतिं श्रितः ।
गोहिंसा-साधके मित्र-मखे द्वेषमधारयत् ॥३॥
स्वदेशे रुद्धशक्तिः स पूर्वदेशमुपागतः ।
लब्धवान् कार्यसिद्धि वै व्युषिताश्वं यदाश्रितः ॥४॥
अहो कालस्य वैचित्र्यं तदुत्तरयुगे खलु ।
बहूनां यजताख्यानां मध्ये मित्रो व्यराजत ॥५॥
गोस्वामिपदयोग्यस्य जरठोष्ट्रस्य देशिनः ।
भारतीयेन विप्रेण स्मृतिपूजा विधीयते ॥६॥
सर्वदेशसमायात-प्राच्यविद्याविपश्चिताम् ।
मनःप्रसादनं यत् स्यात् प्रार्थनमेतदेव हि ॥७॥

1. "Making obeisance to the Great Lord, the sustainer of the Universe through Wisdom the nature of the religious reform of Zarathushtra is being shown here.
2. Zarathushtra was the worshipper of one God and an adherent of Righteousness alone and he had a hatred for violence and all other acts of unrighteousness.
3. He held the view that cattle deserved to be protected and not killed. He, therefore, set his face against the worship of Mithra in which cattle-slaughter took place.
4. Unable to prevail in his own land, he turned to the

East and obtained success when he came to the court of king Vistāspa.

5. This Indian Brahmin pays homage to the Great Master Zarathushtra who can be fitly called a Gosvāmin (literally "Lord of the Cattle").
6. Strange is the way of Time, that after the disappearance of the Prophet, Mithra became the Chief of the Adorable Ones among his own followers !
7. I seek by this effort to please the minds of Orientalists who have come here from many lands."]

Much has been written on the nature of the reform introduced by Zarathushtra in the religion of Iran but still we have not understood the subject very clearly. This is due to two reasons ; (1) Our materials are largely obscure and (2) the pioneers in this subject of study have made certain assumptions on inadequate grounds which have been accepted by later writers as proved conclusions. The historical point of view has also failed to receive that attention which it deserves. The study of Comparative Religion shows that even in the field of religion change takes place in course of time due to various factors, racial, social or environmental. Under these circumtances, re-examination of the problem before us may not prove a fruitless quest. "The slow, the never-ending approach to truth", says Sir James George Frazer, "consists in perpetually framing and testing hypotheses, accepting those which at the time seem to fit the facts and rejecting the others."[1] This is my justification for standing before you with this problem. A student of the Vedas may also be in a position to see things from an angle that may be profitable.

Our sources of information for what Zarathushtra taught are (1) the 17 *Gāthās* in the *Yasna* of the Avesta, (2) the *Younger Avesta*, (3) Pahlavi literature and (4) References in foreign literatures, chiefly Greek and Latin. Of these sources the *Gāthās* are the most important and the most authentic, because the numerous personal reminiscences in them, as in *Yasna* 28.8,

---

[1] *The Golden Bough*, Abridged Edition, p.62.

44.18, 46.1-2, 50.1, 9 and 51.10-12, shows that they come from the Prophet himself or his associates (e.g. in *Ys.*, 28.6, *Zarathustrāi......ahmaibyācā*).

The *Younger Avesta*, however, fathers on Zarathushtra thoughts and utterances which it is more or less certain he never entertained or even run counter to the spirit of the Gāthās. The texts contained in the *Younger Avesta* have, therefore, to be utilised with the greatest amount of circumspections. What a great Master has taught has often been changed by his followers through what Mrs. Rhys Davids called "more wording". What is true about the *Younger Avesta* is still more so about the Pahlavi literature. The references in Graeco-Roman and other literatures also suffer from being based on late institutions and insufficient understanding of foreign ideas.

The information gathered from the Pahlavi literature about the home of Zarathushtra, viz., Raga (modern Rai) in Adarbaizan, can, however, be safely accepted as correct. It is well known that there is a great difference in language between the *Gāthās* (with which are to be classed the *Hās* called *Yasna Haptahyāiti*) and what is called the *Younger Avesta*. The *Younger Avesta* is certainly younger in age than the Gāthās but the difference in age is not sufficient to explain the difference in language. We are, therefore, forced to admit a difference in dialect due to different areas of origin. Paul Tedesco has demonstrated from a searching examination of different dialects of Iran what had been always suspected, viz., that the Gāthās are in the language of Media[2]. Opinion is also practically agreed on the Younger Avesta belonging to Eastern Iran.[3]

There is, however, no agreement among scholars about the date of Zarathushtra. There is no adequate reason for rejecting the data preserved in Zoroastrian literature itself. People may exaggerate the antiquity of the founder of their religion but certainly not underrate it. The Pahlavi literature

---

2. *Le Monde Oriental*, 1921, pp. 184-288.
3. Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, pp. 84-6.

has *not* confused Vistāspa the patron of Zarathushtra with Vistāspa the father of Darius. We can, therefore, safely take the traditional date, recently confirmed by a Syrian tradition preserved by Theodore bar Rhoni, viz. 628-9 B.C.,[4] as a near approximation about the birth of Zarathushtra I have shown elsewhere[5] that W. W. West's socalled "correction" in the traditional date is uncalled for. The linguistic argument that is frequently trotted out against this late date does not bear careful examination.

We may also accept as correct the broad features of the *life* of Zarathushtra as given in Pahlavi literature, viz., his first "vision" at the age of 30, conversion of King Vistāspa of Eastern Iran through the help of the Prophet's adherent and son-in law Jāmāspa when Zarathustra was 42 years old and his death at 77. *It took Zarathushtra many years to get men accept his teaching.* He or a follower of his asks (in his name) in *Yasna* 46.1 : "To what land am I to run, where am I to go (kaṁ nemoi zaṁ kuthrānəmoi ayenī) ?" This Gāthā shows clearly the opposition that Zarathushtra met with and his anxiety for a powerful supporter. The last verse of this Gāthā tells us that Kavā Viśtāspa was the supporter who helped his mission. Vistāspa's acceptance of the new creed was thus a landmark in Zoroastrian history and was gratefully commemorated by the faithful.

Let us now try to see what light our sources throw on the *religion* that the Prophet taught. Great Teachers are born in different lands either (1) to give a fresh impulse to the dormant religious feelings of the country, i.e., to reassert the old truths and give them a new span of life or (2) to teach new ideas in the field of religion. Even in the latter case there is never a complete breaking away from the past. Srī Rāmakrishna illustrates the former type and Christ and Muhammad represent the latter. The Jews did not deny the existence of

---

4. A.V.W. Jackson, *Zoroastrian Studies*, p. 250.

5. K. Chaṭṭopādhyāya, *Proceedings of All India Oriental Conference*, held at Tirupati, pp.

any god other than Yahve but they themselves worshipped the latter alone, though the old Testament shows lapses in this matter that people were "guilty" of from time to time against which their Prophets spoke with fervour again and again. In the teachings of Christ there was no reference to other gods. Monotheism was taken for granted. Emphasis was laid here on a loving *devotion* to God and an equal loving service to his creation. Muḥammad carrying on the tradition of the Propghets of Israel and the teachings of Christ of which he had some knowledge took up an uncompromising and clear stand on the unity of God (*Lā ilāha illa illāh,* "there is no god but God").

It was been assumed that Zarathushtra introduced monotheism in Iran in place of the old Aryan polytheism.[6] That Zarathushtra was extremely conscious of his teaching something new is clear from the Gāthās. Had monotheism been in this opinion his new teaching he would have certainly made a clear declaration to that effect. That declaration is missing. He too recognised the existence of gods (*daevas* who are 'gods' in the Gāthās and not yet 'demon's) but he ignored them and placed his heart on Mazda or Ahura or Mazda Ahura or Ahura Mazda (Ys. 50.11 Aṯ vé staotā aojāi Mazdā, Your praiser will I declare myself, O Mazda. It is to be noticed that the Gāthās simply assume the existence of Mazda Ahura and do not try to prove it. The very name does not occur in the Gāthās in the stereotyped form that we find later. Though Zarathushtra was not a monotheist of the type of Christ or Muhammad, he was nonetheless worshipper of Mazda Ahura *alone* we have here the parallel of the *aikāntika* (exclusive) cult of the Sātvatas or Vaiṣṇavas of India, in fact of all sectarians in Hinduism: among the many gods (*devatās*) that one is chosen as God (Bhagavān) or 'Chosen Deity' (*Iṣṭa-Devatā*) who appeals to the devotee most. It is a peculiar kind of *psychological* monotheism unlike the *theological* monotheism of Christianity or Islam. Why Mazda Ahura, the 'Wise Lord' was the

---

6. E.S.D, Bharucha, *Zoroastrian Religion and Customs*, 3rd ed., 1928, p. 28.

'Chosen Deity' of Zarathuhstra will appear in the sequel. The Ameśa Spentas of later Zoroastrian theology are mentioned in the Gāthās but they are moral qualities sometimes personified like *śraddhā* (faith) in the Vedas and not distinct beings.

It has been generally asserted that Zarathushtra taught Dualism. The classical writers have said this. The Younger Avesta teaches it and Zoroastrian literature gives a whole scheme of *ahuraic* and *daēvaic* nomenclatores. If there is anywhere a declaration of faith in Zarathushtra's Gāthās, it is in *yasna* 30, where we have the enunciation of a dualism. But this dualism has nothing to do with the cosmic dualism of the Vendidad. Zarathushtra speaks here about a moral dualism, the two paths of good and evil, either of which man is free to choose, which lead, however, to different consequences. The two *mainyā* referred to in verse 4 of *Yasna* 30 are simply the two spirits of good and evil and not Spenta Mainyu and Ahura Mainyu of later Zoroastrian theology. The supremacy of Mazda Ahura is clearly maintained by Zarathushtra for the Wise Lord rewards the good and punishes the evil (verse 10). The overcoming of the evil is now and here in our personal lives and not in a distinct cosmic epoch.

Zarathushṭra thus laid great emphasis on the moral iife. *This appears to be his basic teaching.* We have all throughout the Avesta reference to 'good thought', 'good speech' and 'good deed'. Classical writers have also emphasised this aspect of Zarathushtra's teaching. Zarathushtra laid great emphasis on *aśa* or righteousness. In Yasna 50.11, teferred to above, immediately after declaring his resolution to be the praiser of Mazda, he named *Aśa* in the same breath. *Aśa* is referred to again in the Gāthās and the Younger Avesta and is the subject matter of the Zoroastrian Common Prayer, the famous Asdm Vohu, which is also in the Gāthic dialect.

Zarathushtra's attitude towards the evil life was not *passive* but one of *active* opposition. This appears throughout the Gāthās and the latter literature. One of the evils that is much inveighed against is *Aesma*, violence. One of the forms that violence took was violence towards cattle, which Zarathushṭra hated with all the vigour that he could command. *Yasna* 29 may or may not have been the actual composition of Zarathushtra but this Gāthā is a clear declaration of Zarathushtra's faith in the protection of cattle. He is here described as the protector of cattle appointed by God, the Creator of cattle. Throughout the Gāthās we have expressions of solicitude for cattle. Avesta praised careful husbandry and settled agriculture. Separate reference to the ox and the cow in verse 5 of *Yasna* 29 makes untenable the view of those scholars who take the Gāthā as an allegory on protection of the earth, *Geuś urvā* meaning, according to them, the soul of 'the cow the earth'. Zarathustra, who is here made out as 'the protector of cattle', was not a ruler of the earth. *Geus* 'of the cow' must, therefore be taken in a literal sense.

Zarathushtra's opposition to violenee to the cattle was so great that he had no hesitation in setting his face against cults that favoured it. The most important text in this connexion is *Yasna* 32. Verse 4 expresses indignation at the fact that those who did wrong actions were called *daevo-vuśtā*, 'beloved of the gods' (devānām priyāḥ). The particular wrong action meant here becomes clear from verses 8, 10, 12 and 14 of the Gāthā, viz., slaughter of the ox with joyous cry apparently in a cult sacrifice and eating of cow's flesh evidently as *haviḥ-śeṣa* at the end of the sacrifice. Verses 10 and 14 show that the festival was associated with the worship of a solar deity, the *dūra-ośa* ('of far-radiating effulgence') who was to be caused to *shine*. Mithra, in whose cult as known to us from Roman remains of Mithraism there was representation of the deity riding a bull and thrusting a danger into its heart, at once comes to our mind. It appears that the great feat of Mithra was imitated in the annual ceremony of Mithra worship on the new Year's day. Ktesias tells us, "Among the Persians however the king was permitted to be intoxicated on the one day while sacrifice was offered to Mithra"[7]

This was evidently as a preparation for the slaughter of an ox in the sacrifice. It is probably against this intoxication in Mithraic *tauroboliem* that Zarathushtra speaks in Yasna 48. 10 *kadā ajān mūthrəm ahyā madahya* (Geldner's reading *agahyā*) 'when shall I drive away the filthy liquor of this intoxication ?'

---

[7] Cumont, *Texts et Monuments relatif aux Mithraisme*, Volume II, p. 10,

The cult of Mithra, however, seems to have been firmly entrenched in the minds of Zarathushtra's compatriots and in opposing it he knocked his head against the wall. He could not get a hearing in his native land and he had to flee it. There is a near parallel in Muhammad's flight from Mekka. It was only in Eastern Iran, in the vicinity of India, that the Iraninian prophet could get a soil where his ideals could take root. The doctrine of *ahiṁsā*, non-violence, had by now begun to take a firm hold on large sections of the Indian mind in spite of the slaughter of animals that took place in the Vedic sacrifice. The cow was called in the later Vedic texts *aghnyā* 'not deserving to be killed'. Though sacrifice of a barren cow was a feature of the last ceremony in the Agniṣṭoma Soma sacrifice, substitution of cow's meat by the curd of cow's milk had come about. In the *madhu-parka* ceremony for the welcome of an honoured guest the Gṛhya *Sūtras* begin to show the alternative of letting off of the living cow after her ceremonial offering in place of her actual slaughter. Zarathuthtra's opposition to Mithra and similar other deities favouring violence was so great that in Yasna 30.6, he included *daevas*, 'gods' among those who chose the evil. It is on account of expressions like this that the later pejoration of the meaning of the word *daeva* came about.

Strange is, however, the course of history ! Zarathushtra was a Median. He may or may not have been a Magian also. But when Zarathushtra's religion spread throughtout Iran, probably in the reign of the later Achaemenians, the Magis who were organised priests among the Medians, probably stepped forward as the priests of the religion preached by the Median founder. If this happened, it was inevitable that many characteristic Magian or Median ideas should enter the Zoroastrian religion through these priests. Next of kin marriage is certainly one of these Median ideas. Herodotus tells us that this practice differentiated the Medians from the Persians. *The worship of Mithra also entered the Zaroastrian faith* in later times. It was, however, divested of the slaughter of cattle. In the *Mihir Yaśta* and the inscriptions of Artaxerxes I and II Mithra had become almost co-evol with Ahura Mazda. The history of Mithraism in the Roman world through the influence of Persian legionaries in the Roman army is well known.

At the end let me pay my homage to the memory of Gosvāmin Zarathushtra who taught us non-violence for the cattle world. May this spirit of non-violence descend on the whole of mankind and peace and good-will for fellow beings guide the action of man throughout the world !

## CHAPTER VII

# CAN WE ACCEPT THE TRADITIONAL DATE OF ZARATHUSHTRA

जनार्दनं नमस्कृत्य प्रयते कालनिर्णये ।
स्पितमान्वयजातस्य जरठोष्ट्रस्य शासितुः ॥
ईशख्रिष्टोदयात्पूर्वं सप्तमे शतके ह्यसौ ।
लब्धवान् पार्थिवं जन्म व्युषिताश्वस्य सद्गुरुः ॥
इति या पारसीदेशे सम्प्रदायगता प्रथा ।
तन्निराकरणे हेतुः पुष्कलो न हि विद्यते ॥

(Paying obeisance to JANARDANA, I attempt to determine the time of ZARATHUSHTRA of the family of SPITAMA, the great Prophet. There is no adequate ground for rejecting the tradition that this Preceptor of King VISTASPA had his earthly incarnation in the seventh century before Christ).

It is well known that Iranian tradition places the birth of Zarathushtra, the founder of the Parsi religion in the seventh century B.C. W.W. West tried to fix the date through an examination of the Pahlavi *Bundahis* (XXXIV, 7-8), *Arta-Viraf Namak* (I, 1-5) and *Selections from Zat-Sparam* (XXIII, 11-12). He thought that the date given by the *Bundahis* was 625 B.C. He introduced a correction by adding 35 years on the basis of his understanding of the two other texts, giving the date as 660 B.C.[1], which was accepted by A.V.W. Jackson when he wrote *Zoroaster*. Jackson later brought to our notice a tradition given by the Syrian scholiast, Theodore bar Khoni, of about the end of the sixth century A.D., "From Zaradusht to the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ are six hundred and

---

1. SBE, XVII, pp xx vii ff.
2. PP. 157 ff.

twenty-eight years and seven months."[3] As in the case of Jesus Christ, "from Zarathusht" must mean from his birth. In a paper communicated to the All-India Oriental Conference, held at Tirupati in March 1940, I tried to show that Wests' correction was uncalled for and the date given by Theodore bar Khoni gives us a near enough approximation to the Iranian tradition about Zarathushtra's birth.[4]

This date about the birth of Z. is confirmed by two other traditions. (1) Al-Biruni (973-1048 A.D.), the great Arab mathematician and chronologist says that from Zarathushtra's "appearance till the beginning of the Aera Alexandri", the Persians "count 258 years".[5] The era of Alexander seems on Al Biruni's own statement to start from 330 B.C.[6] There is a little uncertainty about the meaning of the expression "appearance". If it means birth, its date will be 588 B.C. But the natural meaning of "appearance" will be appearance before the public as a preacher. It is well known that Z. could not succeed in his preachings till he converted Jāmāspa, the minister of King Vistaspa, and two years later the King himself. The conversion of Jamaspa took place when the prophet was 40 years of age and of the King at 42. If al Biruni means either of these two incidents, the date of birth works out as 628 B.C. or 630 B.C., almost the same as given by Theodore bar Khoni. (2) There was a well authenticated tradition curreut in Persia that a cypress tree was planted at Kashmir by Z. or Vistaspa to commemorate the latter's conversion, which was felled under orders of the Caliph Mutawakkil in 861 A.D. after it had lived for 1450 years.[6] As the tradition was Persian and not Arabian, we must understandhere solar yeass and not lunar years. This gives the date of planting of the tree, and consequently of Vistaspa's conversion, as 589 B.C. The date of the birth of the Prophet according to this tradition would be 631 B.C., not far away from the dates given by the Syrian Scholiast or Al Biruni.

---

[3] *Zoroastrian Studies*, pp 249-251.

[4] *Proceedings of the X All India Oriental Conference*, Tirupati, pp. 64-67.

[5] *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, tr. E. Sachau, p. 17.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[7] A.V.W. Jackson, *Zoroaster*, pp. 163.4, Zoroastrian Studies, pp. 255-66.

Johannes Hertel identified Vistaspa, the patron of Z., with Vistaspa the father of the Achaemenian King Darayavaush (Darius I), who reigned from 521 to 485 B.C., and on the basis of this identification placed the period of the prophet's activity between 559 and 522 B.C.[8] The identification of the two Vistaspas has been rejected by a number of scholars ; including A. Meillet,[9] and cannot be seriously entertained. Though Meillet considers the traditional date to be a reasonable one,[10] K.F. Geldner,[11] C. Bartholomae,[12] E. Meyer,[13] E. H. Moulton[14] and other scholars have considered it too late. Various arguments, historical and linguistic, have been put forward to prove an earlier date. It will be my endeavour to show that these arguments have no force.

I shall first take up the linguistic argument. It is commonly believed that the language of the *Gāthās* of Z. is very similar to that of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā*. As the latter text cannot be brought down to a date later than —1000 B.C., it is argued that Z. cannot be given a date later than +1000 or perhaps 800 B.C. I shall show below that the agreement between the languages of the *Gāthās* and the *Ṛgveda-saṁhtiā* has been exaggerated. Even if, however, the two languages were very similar, the conclusion sought to be drawn does not follow.

Languages belonging to the same family but spoken in

---

8. *Die Zeit Zoroasters.* West, SBE, p. xiii of K. V. Lohrāspa of Vf. of D—Cispiś

9. IRAS, 1925, p. 754, BSOS, III, pp 747 ff., I.H.Q. I, pp 7-16, A Meillet, *Trois Conferences sur les Gatha de l'Avesta*, p. 24.

10 *Loc cit* , p. 31.

11 *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 11th ed., Vol. XXI, pp 246-7 and Vol. XXVIII, p.1041.

12 *Zarathushtra Leben und Lehra,* pp 10-11.

13 *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 11th ed., XXI, p. 205.

14 *Early Zoroastrianism,* pp 17 ff.

different areas can and generally do change at different rates. Sometimes the same language changes quickly in the homeland but remains practically unaltered for a long time in a distant colony surrounded by dissimilar languages. Let us take the case of the Balto-Slavic languages. They show themselves to us in an earlier form of development than the neighbouring Teutonic or Romance languages, preserving many of the two other groups. Of the Balto-Slavic languages, Lithuanian, it should be remembered, has a rich inflection and still preserves the musical accent of the *Vedas* and of Ancient Greek. A few short sentences can be composed in Lithuanian which would be almost the same in Sanskrit, e.g., *tāvas devas mānas devas esti*, 'thy god is my god,' is not far removed from Sanskrit *tava devas* (*devo*) *mama devas aśti* (*devo'sti*), with exactly the same meaning. But are we entitled to remove Girenas or Kurschat or Donalitus or our contemporaries in Lithuania to the times of Pāṇini or Zarathushtra ? The Spanish language that it now spoken in Central America agrees more with sixteenth century Spanish than with the language spoken in Spain to-day.[15] My friend Dr. Paul Thieme told me, when he was with us in the Allahabad University before the Second World War, about sixteenth century German being spoken in Siebenbuergen in Hungary. Dekkani-Urdu spoken in Hyderabad today agrees more with the Urdu spoken in Delhi in the fifteenth century than with the Urdu spoken here today. Instances may be multiplied of the same language spoken in different areas showing different stages of devlopment. When the languages belonging to different areas are not *same* but *similar*, there is still greater possibility of different rates of growth. The supposed similarity between the languages of the *Gāthās* of Z. and the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* cannot, therefore, prove their contemporaneity or near contemporaneity.

Let us also examine the nature of the similarity itself. A close examination of the language of the Gāthās shows that it comes nearer to that of the younger Avesta and even of the inscriptions of the Achaemenian Kings, none of which are earlier than 521 B.C. Geldner, who uses the argument of the

---

[15] *Cambridge History of India*, Vol I, p. 75.

Vedic and Avestic languages for dating Z. much earlier than the seventh century B.C., gives away his whole case when he says about the language of the latest inscriptions in Ancient Persian that "on the whole it is almost as antique as Zend (i.e. Avestan), with which it has many points in common."[18] To illustrate the statement that that Ancient Persian inscriptions have many points in common with Avestan he quotes the following A.P. inscription :

> "Auramazdā hya imām bumim adā hya avam asmānam adā hya martiyam adā hya śiyātim adā martiyahyā hya Dārayavaum khshāyathiyam akunaush aivam paruvanām khshāyathiyam"

and then renders it into Avestan as

> "Ahuro mazdāo yo imam būmīm adāt yo aom asmanem adāt yo mashīm adāt yo shāitīm adāt mashyahe yo Dārayatvohūm kshaetem akerenaot oyūm pourunām khshaetem"

I may now render the A.P. passage into Sanskrit, using Vedic forms when they come nearer :

> "Asuro medhā (usual Vedic madhiraḥ, Classical Sanskrit medhanu) ya imām bhūmim adhāt ya imam ākāśam (phonetically, aśmānam) adhāt yo martyam adhāt yaḥ sātim adhāt martyasya yo Dhārayadvasuṁ kshayantam akṛṇot (Classical, *akarot*) ekam purūṇāṁ kshayatam."

It will be noticed that there are striking resemblances between A.P. forms and Vedic forms (e.g. *akunaush* and *akṛṇot*) and that in certain respects A.P. comes nearer to Vedic and Classical Sanskrit and Gāthic than to younger Avestan (e.g. *martiyahyā* is similar in termination to Gathic *mashyahya* and Sanskrit *martyasya*, the younger Avestan form *mashyahe* being a further development). It should be further noticed that the stem *martya*—in A.P. comes nearer to Sanskrit *martya*—than the Avestan *masha*—. Ancient Persian, as available to us, is factually not earlier than ±510 B.C. We cannot take it to a much earlier period on *a-priori* grounds, as is sought to be done in the case of the Gāthās of Z.

I now take at random a verse from the *Gāthās* and

---

16 *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., XXI p. 247 b.

subject it to a linguistic analysis. The verse I selcct is *Yasnā* 29.2'

Adā tashā geush peresat ashem kathā toi gavoi rathush hyat hīm dātā xsayanto hadā vāstrā gaodāyō thwaxsho kem hoi ushtā ahurem ye dregvo-debish aeshemem vādāyoit.

There are my linguistic comments:

| | |
|---|---|
| Ada | —*adha* or *adha* in Vedic and *adha* in classical Sanskrit |
| Tasha | —*takshan* in Vedic and Takshaka in classical Sanskrit. |
| Geush | —*gos* in both, but the pronunciation being, according to the *Pratisākhyas*, *gaus*. If *e* and *o* were *sandhyakṣaras*, diphthongs, according to the *Pratiśākhyas*, they may have been so for both Vedic and classical Sanskrit. |
| Peresot | —*apṛcchat* in Sanskrit, the augment being dropped in many cases in Vedic and only in the aorist with the prohibitive particle *mā* in classical Sanskrit. |
| Ashem | —*Ṛtam* in both Vedic and Sanskrit. The A.P. stem *arta* comes near to Vedic and Sanskrit. |
| Katha | —*katham* in both. |
| Toi | —*te* in both, but probably pronounced earlier as *tai*. |
| Gavoi | —similarly *gave*, pronounced as *gavai*. |
| Ratush | —stem not used in either in the sense of a chief. |

Hyat is similar to A.P. and a development from Aryan Vedic yet and clasical yat, found in the Y.A.

| | |
|---|---|
| Him | —*sim* which is Vedic only |
| Data | —*dhata* in both |
| Xshayanto | —*kshayataḥ* in both. The retention of the nasal in accusative plural in *śatr* stems in found in Prakrits. |
| Hadā | —*sadha* in Vedic and *saha* in classical Sanskrit. |
| Vāstrā | —the instrumental singular termination of a stems is always changed into—*ena* or *ina* in classical Sanskit but-ā, as here, in the Vedas, |

*side by side* with *ena* or *ina* as in the case of the pronouns. Pronominal inflections generally preserve old forms. ā is the termination in Vedic and Classical in the case of all consonantal stems and vocalic feminine stems and *i* and *a* masculine stems with the insertion of v or n to prevent a hiatus.

**Gaodāẏö** —*godhayas* (or *gaudhayas*) in Vedic and *godham* in classical.

**Owax̣śō** —**tvakshas in Vedic.*

**Kəm** —*kam* in both.

**Hoi** —*Sah* in both.

**Uśtā** —**vashṭa* or *vashitā* in both, in periphrastic future (luṭ)

**Ahurəm** —*asuram* in both.

**Yə** —yah in both

**Dregvo debis** —**druhvad—devebhiḥ* in Vedic. In classical Sanskrit the instrumental termination is always —*ais*. The Vedic language shows—*ais* and *bhis* (as in all other cases in classical Sanskrit). It cannot, however, be claimed that—*bhis* 'is the older from, because —*bhis* had already been substituted by—*ois* in the case of *o* stems(=*a* stems in Sanskrit) of primitive Indo-European.[17] Vedic alternative formation *devebhir* side by side with *devaiḥ* is an analogical formation like the later Prakrit constant *devehi*. The same is the explanation of the use of the—*a* termination in the case of *a* stems, side by side with —*ena* or —*ina*, in 'the Vedic language.

**Vādāyoit** —**bādhet* in Vedic and *bādhet (correctly *bādheta* in classical Sanskrit. It will be noticed that the Gāthic form comes nearer to classical Sanskrit than to Vedic.

---

[17] K. Brugmann, *Comparative Grammer of the indo-germanic Languages* (English Translation), Vol. III p. 379.

The above analysis will show that though the Gāthic language shows agreements with Vedic forms, it also shows agreements with Classical Sanskrit. There are agreements with Prakrits also. A complete statistical enquiry about the agreements of the gāthic language with younger Avesta, Ancient Persian, Vedic Sanskrit, Classical Sanskrit and Prakrit will show the hollowness of the linguistic argument about the antiquity of the *Gāthās* and their author Zarathushtra.[18] Even as it is, my general remarks and what I have said already about the languages of the Ancient Persian Inscriptions and the *Gāthās* show that the linguistic argument has no probative value in determining the age when Zarathushtra. lived.

We should also in this context bear in mind the following facts in connexion with the Vedic language and its date, (1) the *Rgveda saṁhitā* is not a work of one single deriod, but contains materials of various ages, from the earliest to almost the latest period of the Vedic age, (2) that even some late hymns of this text show an early language, evidently traditional language preserved by the priests in imitation of older models and (3) scholars have not yet arrrived at any agreement about the date of the entire Vedic literature or of the *Ṛgveda-saṁhitā* in particular. There is no justification, as adequately shown by Moritz Winternitz in his *Geschihte der indischen Literatur*, Bd. 1, and elsewhere, to assume as proved a date like the 10th or the 12th century for the *Ṛgvedasaṁhitā*. To line the date of Zarathushtra's *Gāthās* with that of the *Ṛgvedasaṁhitā* is, therefore,' an extremely unwise step.

Let me now pass on to the historical arguments. This is based on the use of proper names derived from *mazda*—and of the expression *Assara Mazash* in Assyrian documents prior to the seventh century B.C.

The Assyrian king Sargon received in 715 B.C. the tribute of a number of Median princes two of whom bear names similar to *Mazdaka*.[19] They are actually *Mashdaku* and *Mash-*

---

[18] A pupil of mine is engaged in this work.

[19] Hommel, *Ethnographie und Geschichte des alten Orients*, p. 198, n.i, etc.

*takku.* It cannot be doubted that *Mazdaka* is derived from the name *Mazda* used for God in the Avesta from themselves are not compounded but stand the *Gathas* of Z. downwards. Now Eduard Meyer says, "this name was the invention of Zoroaster himself, and he who names himself after Mazda thereby makes a confession of faith in the religion of Zoroaster whose followers, as we know, termed themselves Mazdayasna 'worshippers of Mazda'. The doctrine of Zoroaster predominated in Media in 714 B.C. obviously his appearance in the role of prophet must have been much earlier."[20] Before examining the soundness of this view, I place before you the facts in connexion with the expression *Assara Mazas* because it has an important bearing on the significance of the name *Mazdaka.*

The Assyrian King Ashurbanipal (669-626 B.C.) had collected two splendid libraries at Nineveh.[21] In one of these has been found a list of gods, foreign and native, among them figuring the names *Assara* and *Mazas*[22] Hommel transliterates the passage thus:

D.P. As—sa—ra D.P. ma—za—aś
D.P. Igigi ilāni sha shame—e
D.P. A-nun-na ki ilāni irsi-tim
lines 24.26,[23]

This has been hailed enthusiastically as making of a reference to the definitely Zoroastrian Ahur Mazda with the seven Archangels and the seven Archfiends of Zoroatrianism.[24] *Assara,* it cannot be doubted, stands for the Aryan word *Asura* Iranian, *Ahura*) and Mazaś for Aryan **Maizdhas* (Iranian Mazda). The name for God in the younger Avesta is *Ahnramazda* and in the Ancient Persian inscriptions *Auramazda.* In the Gathas of Z., however, it is *Mazda* or *Ahura* only or *Mazda Ahura, Ahura Mazda*; even when both the words are used, they are not compound but standed apart, often separated by a number of words. This shows that so for as Z., the founder of the Parsi religion, is concerned the two words were not inseparable as in later times. They appear in the *Gathas* as two distinct words like *Īśvara* and *Paramatman* in India, though meaning the same individual. In the Assyrian inscription, however, each of the two words *Assara* and *Mazaś* is preceded by the determinative of a god, *ilu*. The Assyrian writer, therefore, did not take the two names as meaning the same deity. This may be significant, if the use of the determinative *ilu* before *Mazas* is not due to ignorance. But what is very important is the use of the sibilant in both the names. In all the three Iranian dialects known to us, Gathic, younger Avestan and Ancient Persian, initial or intervocalic s of Aryan is changed into *h* or lost. It is preserved in the Avesta before *k*, *c*, *t*, *p* and *n* initially. Internally it is preserved before the same letters when it is preceded by *a*, *á* or *ā*.[25] *Assara* must be, therefore, pre-Gathic or hailing from a dialect unknown to us that *Z. did not speak*. The sibilant does appear in the Gāthās at the end of a number of words, *haxas, Āramaitis* etc. in the Gāthās but the particular word *Mazda* never shows the sibilant in either the *Gathas* or the *younger Avesta*. We cannot, therefore, connect either *Assara* or *Mazas* with Zarathushtra. Hommel is, therefore, right when he says that "we have here the same older pronunciation of Eranian words as in the Kassite *Suriash*, "sun" (later *Ahura* and *Havarya*, but comp. Sanskrit *Asura* and *suriya*), which is of the highest importance for the history of the Aryan languages."[26] I might add here two other Kassite names *Gandash*, *Burnaburias*, and *Maruttash*.

---

[20] *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 11th ed., P. 205 a.

[21] *Cambridge Ancient History,* III P. 88, *et passim*

[22] Rawlinson, *Western Asian Inscriptions,* III, p. 66.

[23] *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology,* 1899, p. 127. I am grateful to the authorities of the British Museum for photostat copies of pages 126, 127, 138 and 139 of the gournal.

[24] *Cambridge History of India,* I. p. 76,

This shows that the divine names *Assara* and *Mazash* were in circulation in Iran as divine names before Z. preached his religion. Ashurbanipal was in the habit of copying old texts in his library. This particular document may, therefore, be an early one. But it is at least as early as his own date (seventh century B.C.).

---

[25] See Jackson, *Avesta Grammar*, § 109 ff.
Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, p. 86.

[26] *Loc. cit.* p. 139.

The words *Igigi* and *Anunnaki* used after *Assara* and *Mazash* do not make them Zoroastrian names. *Igigi* is the name of a class of Babylonian-Assyrian "gods of the upper world" who are large in number.[27] They are often called *seven*, because the numeral 7 was often used in Assyrian for a large number, corresponding to *viśva* in the Vedic *Viśvadevas*. Similarly, the *Anunnaki* are another class of Babylonian-Assyrian gods, connected with the "lower world,"[28] *not with helt*. They are here separated from the signs for the *Igigi* by a number of other words. The *Igigi* and the *Anunnaki* of this passage cannot, therefore, be connected with the Archangels and the Archfiends of Zoroastrianism. Consequently this document throws no light on the date of Z.

Let us now examine the question of the proper names *Mazdaka* of the eighth century before Christ. If *Mazash* is independent of Zoroastrian usage, we cannot claim that *Mazda* in these theophoric names comes from a Zoroastrian source. Side by side with *Mazdaku*, we have also the name *Daiukku* of another Median prince who was the self-same Sargon led into exile.[29] Herodotus also speaks about a Deiokes who founded the Median kingdom about 609 B.C.[30] *Daiukku* and *Deiokes* would correspond to *Daēvaka* in Avestan. In the younger Avesta *daēva*, though derived from the Indo-European *deivo*, meaning 'god', has acquired the sense of a demon. The word had probably not yet undergone that pejoration of meaning in the *Gāthās*. But they show that Z. did not look at the Daēvas whoever they were, with favour, because they encouraged violence and slaughter of cattle. *Daēvaka* cannot therefore be the name of a follower of Z. Why should *Mazdaka* mean his follower either ? In spite of the bold assertion of Meyer, we have no evidence to show that Z. invented the name. He certainly did not invent the name *Ahura* which also he used for God. This is definitely an Aryan word, if not Indo-European. It is true that the Zoroastrian religion has been called *daēnā māzdayasnī* in *yasna IX*, 26. But it has been called *daēnā āhuirī* in *Vendidad* II, I ff. Raja Rammohan Roy brought about modern India a religious reform which has much resemblance with the reform inaugurated by Z. in Iran and he named his religion *Brāhma Dharma*, the religion of Brahman. *Brahman* was no new name for the deity. It was already there from the time of the Upanishads. He chose it because it conveyed what he stood for. He wanted the worship of one god, (God with a capital) and not the worship of many gods. Zarathushtra similarly stood for the worship of *Mazda* or *Ahura* (i.e. God) instead of that of the *daēvas* (the gods). In fact, the propounder of a new religion cannot succeed in his efforts if he introduces a new name for his deity. The names *Mazdaka* of the Median princes of the eighth centuries before Christ have, therefore, failed to support the claim that Z. had preached his religion before the seventh century B.C.

---

[27] Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, pp. 184-7, Langdon, *Semitic Mythology*, p. 94 et cetera.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Cambridge Ancient History*, III, p. 52.

[30] *History*, Book I, chapters 96-102

I may here mention the view of some Graeco-Roman writers that Z. lived 6000 years before Plato or 5000 years before the Trojan War. Of these the earliest appears to have been Xanthus, the Lydian historian of the fifth century before Christ. His original work is lost but two quotations have been preserved which refer to Z. It is Diogenes Laertius of the second or third century A.D. which gives the date, "6000 years from Zoroaster to the expedition of Xerxes."[31] Moulton wants to change the reading *hexakischilia* (6000 years) of the text into hexakosia (600 years) on the authority of some manuscripts but we have to reject this amendment because just before Diogenes has spoken about

[31] *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Prologue § 2 (Loeb edition, Vol. I p. 5.)

the view of Hermodorus the Platonist that Z. lived 5000 years before the fall of Troy and the Paris Didot edition gives the reading *hexakischilia*. This Graeco-Roman tradition appears to be based on a misunderstanding as pointed out by Jackson, of the Iranian theory of millenial cycles, according to which Zarathushtra's *fravashi* (a kind of guardian angel) was formed 6000 years before he had his revelation.[32] The *younger Avesta* knows of the theory of *fravashis*, because we have a regular *Farvardin yasht* (XIII) there. We have perhaps the germ of the theory of Zarathushtra's *fravashi* in the Gāthās themselves. In *Yasna* 44.11, Zarathushtra speaks about his having been ordained by Ahura Mazda at the beginning (*azem toi āish paouruye fravōivīde*). This Graeco-Roman tradition about the date of Zarathustra has, therefore, no value for us, against clear Zoroastrian tradition.

We are, therefore, left with the consistent Zoroastrian tradition that Z. was born in the seventh century B.C. There is no reason why his followers should not have known when he lived or would have purposely invented a late date for him. The followers of Mahāvīra, Buddha, Christ and Muhammad have preserved the dates of the founders of their religions and there is no reason why we should reject the Zoroastrian tradition. The grounds urged for rejecting the tradition have been found to be hollow. Let us, therefore, agree to accept the tradition.

[32] *Zoroaster*, p. 152. See West, *S.B.E.*, XLVII, pp. xxxix-xli.

## CHAPTER VIII

# THE GROWING PROGRESSIVE IMPORTANCE OF MITHRA WORSHIP IN ZOROASTRIANISM[1]

मित्रं देवं नमस्कृत्य सर्वलोकोपकारकम् ।
जरठोष्ट्रीयधर्मेऽहं विमर्शं कञ्चिदारभे ॥
यद्यपि जरठोष्ट्रेण गोहिंसाकारणात् खलु ।
नादृता मित्रपूजा वै तथाप्यसौ व्यवर्धत ॥

Conservatism in religious practices is a well known phenomenon. This is illustrated in a rather surprising manner in the growing importance of Mithra-worship not only in Iran in general but within the fold of Zoroastrianism, in spite of a hostile attitude towards it in the mind of Zarathushtra.

Mithra was certainly an ancient deity coming down from Indo-Iranian times. We have very clear evidence of this. Mitra, his correlate in India, was worshipped as a single deity or in conjunction with Varuṇa in the Vedas. He was the rising sun or the day sun and his name etymologically meant "the friend". I have shown elsewhere that his associate Varuṇa was the setting sun or the night sun.[2] In Mithraic sculptures found in various parts of the Roman world, we have representation in the background of Mithras riding a bull, the sun rising on one side and the moon setting on the other and two torches held on two sides, one flaming upwards and other downwards.[3] In the treaty between the Hittite king Subbiluluma and the Mitannian king Mativāja of about 1350 B.C., found at Boghazkoi, Mitra is mentioned along with Varuṇa

[1] This paper is a supplement to my paper, "The Religious Reform of Zarathushtra" communicated to the XXV International Congress of Orientalists held in Moscow in 1960 (Proceedings, Vol. II, pp. 197·201.

[2] Presidential Address, Veda Section, All-India Oriental Conference held at Annamalainagar.

[3] Cumont, Texts et Monuments relatif aux Mithraisme, Mysteries of Mithraism,

in a grmmatical form that faithfully reflects the *devatā dvandva* compound of the Vedas.[4] I have drawn from this the conclusion that the four deities Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra and Nāsatyas mentioned in this treaty are not proto-Iranian gods but *Indian* deities, very likely worshipped by a colony of Indians settled in Asia Minor in course of trading in horses.[5] Even if we leave this Indian Mitra out of our account, the Iranian Mithra must have been well established in Iran when Zarathushtra, born in Raga in Media about 630 B.C.,[6] began his religious mission.

We should look for Zarathushtra's Reform what he himself says in the Gāthās. *Yasna* 30, the so-called Dualism text, is, according to its opening words quite an enunciation of his Creed. He distinguishes here between the good way and the evil way and calls upon his listeners to adopt the former and eschew the latter. In *Yasna* 43.12, Zarathushtra tells Mazda Ahura that He had commissioned Zarathushtra to teach *Aśa*, Righteousness, to mankind, which command he faithfully obeyed. Here lies the core of his creed. It is this emphasis on Righteousness which continues all through Zoroastrian history.[7]

Good is to be actively brought into life and evil is to be as actively resisted according to Zarathushtra. One of the forms of evil is violence, *aéśma*, particularly violence towards cattle, the bull and the cow. *Yasna* 29 shows that the Creator made Zarathushtra the protector of these two.[8] This idea is expressed in several other passages of the *Gāthās* e.g. *Yasna* 32.4,10,12 and 14, Yasna 48 (particularly verses 5-7,11,12),51,11,16 and 53,7.

Zarathushtra says in *Yasna* 30 and elsewhere that some

---

[4] *Boghazkoi Studies.*

Presidental Address, Veda Section, All India Oriental Conference, Ninth Session.

[6] Ref. to my paper on West's correction, Jackson's Zoroastrian Studies and my paper in course of publication in the XXVI Congress.

[7] Proceedings, XXV, Congress of Orientalists, Vol. II, p. 200.

[8] *Ante*, p. 200.

Daévas.[9] and men chose the evil path. One of these Daévas appears to me to be Mithra. This is because in the worship of Mithra there was *taurobolium*, slaughter of the bull, as we know from later Mithraism of Roman times. *Yasna* 44, 20, speaks about the *Karapan* and the *usig* subjecting the bull (*gam*) to violence (*aeshdmāi*), evidently in the worship of the *huxshathrā daèvā* mentioned in the same verse. Mitra and the other Ādityas have been called in the Vedas, *sukṣatra*, 'of good dominion,'[1] corresponding to huxshathra here.[10] Intoxication with wine seems to have been associated with this worship of *maga*, as is suggested by Ys. 48.10. *kadā ajə̄n mūth* əm *ahyā magahyā* (Geldner, Westergaard reads *maddahyā*). Ktesias mentions that among the Persians the king was permitted to be intoxicated on the day on which sacrifice was offered to Mithra.[11] It is significant that Ys 48.10 also speaks about the evil rulers of lands *dusthxshathrā dahyunam*.

It is but natural, therefore, that the righteousness-loving and cattle-protecting Zarathushtra should set his face against the slaughter of bulls in the name of Mithra worship. I have suggested in the earlier paper that Zarathushtra received a good deal of opposition from the worshippers of Mithra, who probably made him leave his native land, Media, as is indicated in *Yasna* 46. It is only in the vicinity of India, in the territory of Vishtaspa, king of Zranka (Drangiana), that he could get a proper hearing. In India by this time the cow and the bull were being considered sacred, *aghnya*, 'not deserving to be killed'[12]

Resistance of *taurobolium* in Mithra worship naturally led Zarathushtra to an anti-Mithra attitude which is suggested by a number of passages in the Gāthās, e.g. 32.14 (*hyatcā gāush jaidyāi mraoī yə dūraosəm saocayat avo*). The dūraosha 'of far-radiating effulgence' who is to be caused to shine (Saocayat) is evidently the sun-god Mithra. The expression *saocayāt* here proves that the adjective *dūraosha* meant 'if far-radiating

---

9 The word daeva means in the Gāthās a good and not a demon as in the later Avesta.

10 Macdonell's Vedic Mythology, p.

11 Cumont, Texts et Mounments relatif aux Mithraisme, p. 10.

12 Moscow Proceedings, pp. 200-201.

effulgence' and not 'removing death'. This must be its meaning in Yasna IX when applied to Haoma (Soma). The brilliance of Soma is frequently referred to in the *Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā.*[13]

Thus though Mithra was a popular Indo-Iranian deity, in the first stage of Zoroastrian religious history, we find the Prophet himself opposed to his worship. It is not possible that he ever compromised on this point, adopting Mithra-worship with only its aspect of bull-slaughter removed. His *iṣṭa-devatā,* chosen deity, was Mazda Ahura, the Wise Lord. Tradition has it that he died fighting with his religious adversaries.[14]

Herodotus has given us a picture of the differences in the religious practices of the Persians and the Medians. Among the practices of the Medians are disposal of the dead by exposure and next-of-kin marriage. We find the former enjoined in the *Vendidad* and practised among the adherents of Zoroastrianism even today. Next-of-kin marriage is praised again and again in the Pahlavi texts. e.g. in the *Agdā-Vigāf Nāmeh.* This suggests that the Magas, the well-organised priests among the Medians, could capture power in the Zoroastrian fold and introduce their own special ideas into the religion of Zarathushtra. One of these must have been the worship of Mithra. We have in the younger Avesta, the biggest *Yašt,* the *Mihr Yašt,* in praise of this God Mithra In this *Yašt,* Vərəthraɣna, the god of Victory, goes in his front as a Boar (vv. 70-72), Haoma worships him. Even Ahura Mazda is here represented as worshipping him (vv. 123 and 140). Finally, Ahura Mazda recommends his worship to Zarathushtra ! This is table completely turned. In the stage of the Younger Avesta not only is Mithra re-habilitated but he has become a great god, deserving of worship by the orthodox followers of the Prophet who had repudiated him.

The Ancient Persian inscriptions of the Achaemenian kings also reflect this growth of importance of Mithra-worship.

---

[13] Macdonell's Vedia Mythology, p. 108.

[14] Sten Konow, *Primer of Khotanese Saka,* Oslo 1949, p. 97.

It is now generally recognised that the Achaemenians were followers of Zarathushtra's religion—from the time of Darius. The name Aura Mazda in their inscriptions may not indicate this, though the creed has been called *daēnā māzdayasnī* in *Yasna.*[9] Still the tone of these inscriptions indicates that Darius and his successors were Zoroastrians. Darius (521-485 B.C.) speaks of the aid that Auramazda bore him in the Bihistun Inscription. He does not name any other deity. In the inscription at Naksh-i-Rustam and Susa, he says "A Great God is Auramazda" (*baga vazraka Auramazda*). So does his successor, Xerxes (486-465 B.C.) in his Persepolis inscription. In Persepolis H, Xerxes associates Aśa with Auramazda In Susa C, however, he says "May Auramazda protect me along with the gods" (*Auramazda pātuv hadā bagaibiš*). Who these Bagas were is not clear. They may have been the Ameśa Spentas, one among whom, Aśa, has been mentioned by him in Persepolis H. Lines 35-41 of that inscription mention that he destroyed the sanctuary of the Daivas. The Daivas here appear to be deities who are not to be worshipped or Demons. The Susa A & B inscriptions of Darius II (424-404) mention only Auramazda.

With Artaxerxes II (405-359 the picture alters. In Susa A and D and Hamadan A, Auramazda is associated with Anahitā *and* Mithra. (*Auramazda Anāhitā utā Mithra mām pātuv*) Though in Hamadan C, Auramazda alone is mentioned, in Hamadan B, Mithra alone is referred to (Mithra mām pātuv). The next king, Artaxerxes III (359-338) also associates Mithra with Auramazda in Persepolis A B C & D (*Auramazdā utā Mithra baga pātuv*). Here Mithra is called *baga* 'god'.

It is now clear that the worship of Mithra was fully rehabilitated among the Zoroastrians by the fourth century before Christ. This may be the date of the *Mihir Yaśt*. We need not accept the historical interpretations of this Yaśt offered by E. Herzfeld.[15]

We have the next stage of the expansion of Mithra worship when the Persian soldiers in the army of the Roman empire introduced in Asia Minor, North Africa and large parts of Europe a special Mithra cult, vestiges of which have come down to us. These late archaeological remains have thrown light on ideas and practices prevalent in the time of Zarathushtra himself in the sixth century before Christ. This Mithra cult gave spiritual succour to large numbers of people in Europe and became both a forerunner and a rival of Christianity.

---

[15] Zoroaster and his World, Vol. II. See the critique of his views by Prof. W.B. Henning in the Appendix of R.C. Zaehner's *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism*, pp. 349 354.

The aspect of Mithra worship that was definitely opposed by Zarathushtra, *taurobolium*, appears to have persisted in Mithraism that spread to the West, for Mithra is represented in sculptures as riding on a bull and thrusting a dagger into its heart. We cannot, therefore, consider Mithra of Roman Mithraism a Zoroastrian deity. Many remains of Mithraism are found in Spain. The present day bull fight among the Matadors of Spain may be, for all that we know, a survival of the ceremonial slaughter of the bull, probably on the Naoroz day.

India knew of the Sun-god Mitra from Vedic times. But a special solar cult was later introduced there by Maga Brāhmaṇas, and their later counterparts, the Śākadvīpa Brāhmaṇas, Magian priests or priests hailing from the country of the Śakas. We have settlements of such Brāhmaṇas near old Sun temples in India. The sun-god is generally represented there as wearing trousers in Kushān style. There is a cult of *Mitu-pūjā* (Mitra-worship), also called *Itu-pūjā*, practised by Hindu ladies of Bengal on Sundays in the month of *Agrahāyaṇa* (literally 'first of the year', November-December). The *vratakathā* (story of the cult) starts with an obeisance to Āditya (Sun) and ends with an admonition that one should worship Sūrya on earth. Victorious was the march in the west and the east of Mithras Invinctus !

# INDEX

A
Abhidhānacintāmaṇi, 6
Abhinidhāna, 37
Achaemenians, 85, 140
Achaemenian Inscriptions, 103
Ādityas, 61, 89, 90, 182, 185
Aeshma, 117-19, 163
Agdā-Vigāf Nāmeh, 183
Aghnyā, 124, 165
Agni, 21
— hymn, 87
— Vaiśvānara, 14
Agniṣṭomapaddhati 28
Agniṣṭoma sacrifice, 90, 165
Aharūbo-stōtō, 128, 136
Āhavanīya fire, 8
Ahi, 31
Ahura, 18, 102, 109
— Mazda, 39, 93-4, 107-8, 114-17, 124, 145, 148, 150, 162, 166, 175-6, 184
— worshipping, 102
Ahuna-Vairya, 31
Aindra Mahābhiṣeka, 10
Ainus, 60, 91
Airyana Vaeja, 94
Aitareya Āraṇyaka, 66
— Brāhmaṇa, 6, 58, 67, 75, 90, 123
Al-Biruni, 137, 168
Alexander, 128-29, 133-35, 141-43
Alkibiades I, 143
Akatasha, 117, 121
Akkadian language, 39
Amesha Spentas, 140, 150, 163
Ammianus Marcellinus, 139
Anārṣa, 65
Anāryas, 76
Anaśnant Sāṅgamana, 8
Anau, 43
Andha-paramparā, 84
Āndhras, 11
Andresta, 88
Aṅga, 76, 77
Animatism, 60
Animism, 60
Aṅra Mainyu, 108, 117, 121, 143
Anti-daevic, 102
Anukramaṇī, 13, 97
Anunnaki, 150, 151, 177
Anuyājas, 22
Apām Napat, 88
Āpastamba Vedic School, 4
Āpr-īSūktas, 23, 86
— Sūtras, 24
Āptya, 10
Āraṇyakas, 25
Āri, 34
Aristos, 34
Aristotle, 143
Ariya, 34
Ariya Cithra, 34
Arjuna, 145
Arjunaka, 145
Armenian Vahazan, 57
Arnold, E.V., 86
Arsacides, 134
Ārṣī, 65
Artā Virāf Nāmak, 127-29, 135-6, 166
Artaxerxes, 141, 144
A-ru-na, 40
Ārya, 9, 33-4
Āryas, 45
Arṇa, 9
Ārya Citraratha, 9, 10

Aryan, 4-6, 8, 11-15, 20, 21, 31-34, 45
—birth, 34
—invaders, 43
—migration, 43
—Rudra, 47
—settlements, 9
—vestiges, 38
Aśa, 181
Aśant Pāṁsava, 8
Asəm Vohu, 163
Ashem, 172
Ashurbanipal, 146, 175
Āśira, 74
Aśoka, 128
Assara, 151, 177
Assara-Mazaś, 145, 146, 149, 174
Assyrian Inscriptions, 103
Aṣṭādhyāyī, 66
Astrampsyhos, 142
Asura, 18, 33-4, 47, 86, 101-2, 108, 110-12, 151
Āsura, 86, 110-11, 113
Āsurī, 102, 112-3
Āsurī Ushṇih, 112
Aśvamedha, 22-4, 46
Aśvins, 40, 58
(=Uṣas), 59
—As Morning & Evening Stars, 58
Atharva school, 38
Atharvaveda Saṁhitā, 27, 38, 40, 57
Atirātra, 22-3
Ātityas, 61
Ātman, 60
Aūshadar, 133
Āvahat, 73
Avestā, 18, 33, 39, 52-3, 55, 85-6, 88, 154
Avestan Religion, 85
Ayodhyā, 9
—kāṇḍa, 9
Azhi Dahāka (Ahi Dāsaka), 34, 123

B
Bādarāyaṇa, 60
Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra, 76
—Vedic School, 4
Banerji-Sastri, A.P., 115
Baresman and Brahman, 29
Barhis, 21, 29
Bartholomae, 132, 169
Barrett, 27
Bawri (=Babylonia), 123
Beas, 11, 74, 84
Behar, 14, 15
Belvalkar, S.K., 123
Benveniste, 57
Berar, 6, 7
Bharatas, 11, 21, 72, 74, 77
Bhārati, 101
Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa, 27
Bhīma Vaidarbha, 6
Bhoja, 10
Bhojaship, 10
Bijāpūrkar, V.G., 95
Blinkenberg, 48
Bloomfield, M., 27
Boghazkōi, 39
Bragi, 30
Brāhmaṇas, 5, 14, 25-6, 30, 32-33, 50, 69, 102
Brahman, 28-31
Brahman (=Icelandic bragr), 30
Brāhma Dharma 148, 178
Brāhmī, 113
Brāhmaṇical gods 102
Brāhmins, 9
Brahmo Samaj, 42
Bréal, 111
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 5
Bṛhaddevatā, 66
Buddha, 130, 179
Bundahish, 127-8, 131, 133, 167

C
Caliph Mutawakkil, 130, 138, 168

Caṇḍāla, 45
Caria, 140, 141
Cedī, 5, 7
Celtic, 88
Chakra, 89
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 30
Candragupta Maurya, 128
Charpentier, Jarl, 12, 75, 132
Chaṣāla-trikadruka, 23
Chowdhury, Tarapada, 27, 55
Christ, 130, 161-2, 168
Chronology of Ancient Nations, 137
Cihār-zāda, 128
Ciharāzāt, 133
Citraratha, 9
Comparative Mythology, 62

D

Daĕnā, 178
Daenā āhuīrī, 148
Daeva(s), 102, 109, 113, 115, 119, 151, 177, 182
Daĕvaka, 178
Daevo-vuśtā, 164
Daimönia, 109, 111
Daiukku, 113, 148, 177
Daiva, 151
Daivī, 113
Dakṣiṇā, 42
—diś, 5
Dānastuti, 89
Dārāī, 128, 133
Dārayavashu, 139
Darayavaush (Darius I), 169
Darius, 34
Darśapūrṇamāsa, 122
Das, Abinas Chandra, 93, 96-100
Dāsa, 10, 32-34
Dasyu, 32, 34
—and Dāsa, 31-3, 52
—as noseless, 32
Data, 172
Debtā, 112
Deccan, 5, 6, 10, 11
Deiokes, 113, 140, 177
Deivo, 177
Demon(s), 10, 19, 31, 32, 110, 112
Deshmukh, P.S., 59, 60
Deva, 101, 109
Devaśravas, 77
Devatā, 17
Devatā-dvandva, 39
Devavāta, 77
Dhalla, 119
Dharuṇa, 90
Dhata, 172
Dhruva, 50
Dinkart, 129
Dio Cassius, 88
Diogenes, 178
—Laertius, 142
Dravidian native, 32
Dregv debis, 173
Dṛṣadvatī, 74, 77
Dṛṣṭi, 67
Druids, 69
Dumezil, 29
Dūraosha, 182
Durgāchārya, 96
Dyauspitṛ, 88

F

Farnell, 60
Firdausi, 123
Frāno, 136
Fravartish, 144
Frazer, James George, 29
Fréno, 128

G

Gadā, 89
Gandaś, 147
Gaṅgāsāgar, 58
Ganges, 5, 8
Gaumāta, 34
Gautama Rāhūgaṇa, 13
Gaodāyō̆, 173
Gāthā, 85, 102, 106, 114, 118, 124, 127, 145-6, 149, 151,

152, 154-6, 160, 162-164, 169-71, 174-7, 181
Gāthā Ahunavaiti, 113
Gavoi, 172
Gāyatrī, 112-3
Geiger, Bernard, 57, 90
Geldner, 54, 132, 154, 169-70
Geuś urvā, 164
Ghosh, Batakrishna, 37
Gīlān, 122
Gobhila Gṛhya-sūtra, 27
Gobryas, 142
Gomal, 7
Gomatī, 7
Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, 57
Gotamas, 13
—Rāhugaṇa, 5, 13-4
Grassmann, 54, 95, 97, 98

H

Hadā, 172
Haddon, A.C., 44
Halicarnassus, 140
Haoma, 183
Harappa, 13, 41, 45, 63
Haraqaiti, 95
Harasvatyaḥ, 96
Harisvāmin, 35, 36
Harṣavardhana, 36
Haug, Martin, 101, 107, 109, 112-3, 116, 125-6, 135
Haurvatāt, 117
Haviḥ-śeṣa, 164
Havyavāhana, 21
Hermodorus, 142, 179
Herodotus, 20, 21, 86, 104, 139, 140, 144, 148, 156, 166, 183
Hertel, 29, 132
Herzfeld, E., 115, 184
Hindustan, 4, 14
Hillebrandt, 75, 95, 107
Him, 172
Hittite(s), 39, 40
—texts, 88
Hoi, 173
Hommel, 175-6
Hūmāī, 128, 133-4
Hūṇas, 122

I

Igigi, 150-51, 177
Ilāni, 38-40
Indo-Aryan, 22, 24-5, 66, 102
—period, 88
Indo-European, 66, 83
—animal, 42
—language, 29, 42, 152
—texts, 42
—texts, 88
Indo-Iranian, 22, 40
—schism, 40
—time, 88
Indra, 8-10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21, 30-32, 39, 42, 46, 57, 73, 88, 89, 91, 101-3, 117-8, 120-21, 181
Indra Vṛtrahan, 116
Indus basin, 33, 43, 45, 84
Indus civilization, 44, 50
—as post Ṛgvedic, 41
God, 47
—people, 43
Iranian Harōyu (=modern Harīrūd), 9
Iranians, 20
Irano-Aryans, 102
Islam, 42
Itu-pūjā, 185

J

Jackson, 118, 127, 130, 132-4, 137-8, 144, 167, 179
Jacobi, 8, 48, 50
Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, 27
Jamadagni, 72
Jānāspa, 161, 168
Jowett, 143
Judaism, 42
Juhā, 23
Julius Caesar, 69
Jupiter, 88

K

Kaī Arṭashīr, 144

Kaī-Vishtāsp, 128, 133
Kalevala, 30
Kali Yuga, 135
Kalpa, 18
Kāmya sacrifice, 87
Kāṇva, 5
Karmbha, 23
Karapan, 182
Karka, 28
Karma-kāṇḍins, 42
Karapan, 182
Karuṇa, 90
Katha, 51, 172
Kaulitara, 10
Kautsa, 37-8
Kavaṣa Aitūṣa, 45
Kəm, 173
Keith, A.B., 28-9, 38, 132
Kenopaniṣad, 31
Keśins, 51
Khratu, 55
Kīkaṭa, 5, 11-3, 34, 71-8, 104
(=Kurukṣetra), 77, 84
Kīkaṭeṣu, 77
Kotla Nihang Khan, 77
Kratu, 55
Kṛttikā, 50
Ktesias, 164, 182
Kubhā, 8
Kumārasambhavam, 99
Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, 36
Kunhan Raja, Dr. C., 36
Kuśa, 29
Kuru-Pañcālas, 10, 11
Kurukṣetra, 11-4, 34, 74-77
Kuruma, 8

L

Lakshman Sarup, 26, 35-6, 41, 44-7, 63, 69
Lang, Andrew, 88
Lemminkainen, 30
Liṅgas, 91
Liṅgins, 92
Lithuanian Language, 85
Ludwig, 54, 95

M

MacCuttock, J.A., 70
Macdonell, A.A., 47, 54, 95, 97
Madhu-parka, 165
Magadha, 5, 11, 13, 34, 71, 76-7
Magian(s), 20, 142
Mahādeva, 121
Mahāvīra, 179
Mahīdhara, 28
Maizdhas, (=Iranian Mazda), 175
Maṇḍana, 44
Mangal Deva, 37
Manu, 76
Marett, 60
Marshall, John, 41, 47
Maruts, 32, 88
—('Storm Gods'), 110
Maruttaś, 147
Mashdaku, 145, 148, 174
Mashtakku, 148, 174
Masuda, J., 136
Māthava, 14
Mathura, 11
Mativāja, 180
Mattiuaza, 39
MaxMüller, 4, 25, 37, 46, 84
Māzan, 122
Mazash, 177
Mazda, 178
Mazda Ahura, 181, 183
Mazdāh, 147, 149
(=Skt, medhas), 146
Mazainya, 117, 119
(=Māzandarān), 118
Mazdaka, 149, 174, 177-8
Mazdaku, 177
Mazdas, 151
Mazdayasna, 175
Mcdevittee, W.A., 70
Mediterranean people, 44
Medyomāh, 128, 136
Meillett, A., 132, 154, 169
Meyer, E., 132, 145, 169, 175

Mi-it-ra, 39
Mi-it-ra-ásh-shil, 38
Mihir Yast, 106, 166, 184
Mihr, 183
Milton, 106
Mīmāṁsā, 67
Miocene age, 100
Mitannians, 40
Mithra, 114, 159, 164-6
—cult, 185
—worship, 183
Mitra, 39, 61, 90, 91, 180-82, 184
(=presiding deity), 90
(=rising Sun, 89, 90
Mitrā-Varuṇau, 39
Mohenjo-daro, 13, 41, 43, 45-48, 68-9, 77
Moulton, E.Z., 132, 142-3
Mṛtapas, 45
Muhammad, 161-2, 179

N

Naḍa, 8
Naḍa Naiṣidha, 7, 8
Nadīstuti, 9
Naicāśākha, 12, 74-5
Naksh-i-Rustama, 14, 34
Namī, Sāpya, 5, 13, 14
Namucī, 14, 31, 111
Nāṅhaithya, 117-8, 120-21
Nāsatya, 102, 120, 181
(=Aśvin), 118
Nāsatyā, 40
Na-sha-at-ti-ia-an-na, 39
Nā-sha-at-ti-ya-an-na, 40
Nasu, 121
Next-of-kin marriage, 183
Nīcā-śākha (=nīcaiḥ-śākha), 75
Nighaṇṭu, 96
Nikolaus, 141
Nīnamadhvam, 73
Niṣadha, 5, 7
—country, 5, 7
Niṣadha, 5, 7
Niṣidha, 7, 8
Nirukta, 12, 37, 66, 96
Nirvāṇa, 128
Noah's Ark, 94
Non-Aryans, 12-3, 31-33, 44, 46
Non-Aryan civilization, 51, 84
Non Iranian, 40
Nyag-rodha, 75
Nyabja, 12

O

Oldenberg, 76, 90, 95-6
Oldham, 97
Olmstedd, 147
Oromazus (=Ahura Mazda), 143
Ostanes, 142
Ouranos, 39, 89
Ourṇavābha, 96
Owaxśõ,172

P

Pada-pāṭha, 37, 65-6, 69, 86
Paddhatis, 42
Padma, 89
Pahlavi Literature, 129
Paippalāda, 27
Pali chronicles, 135
Pañcālas, 77
Pañcaviṃśa stoma, 10
Pāṇini, 37-8, 55, 68, 153, 170
Pāṇinīya Śikṣā, 68
Paradise Lost, 106
Paridhi, 23
Paśupati, 48, 121
Patañjali, 45
Pazatas, 142
Peroz, 135
Perron, Anquetidu, 138
Persia, 135
Persians, 20, 21, 86, 135
(=Ancient), 20, 22, 85, 171, 174, 176

Peterson, 96
Phālguna, 50
Pharmakon (drug), 29
Pipru, 32
Plakṣa Prasravaṇa, 14
Plato, 141, 143, 178
Pliocene age, 99, 100
Plutarch, 144
Poseidon, 89
Pradhāna Karman, 30
Prajāpati, 51, 61, 124
Prakrits, 85
Pramaganda, 74, 76-7
Pramagandha, King of Naicāśākha territory, 12
Prauga-śastra, 23, 86
Pratipatti Karman, 21
Prātiśākhya, 38, 65
Pratoli, 96
Prastara, 23
Pravargya, 23
Prāyaścitta, 90
Prayājas, 23, 86
Pre-Aryan civilization, 51
Punjab, 6
Purāṇas, 6, 7, 14, 99, 102, 135
Puranic Śiva, 47
Puroḍāśa, 23
Purūravas, 8
Pūrva-mīmāṁsā sūtras, 37
Pusalkar, 41
Pūṣan, 91
Pūtikā, 22

R

Raghu Vira, 26, 27, 55
Rāhūgana, The Gautama, 13
Rajputa sea, 95, 97, 99
Raja Rammohan Roy, 148,
Rajavade, 55
Rājya, 10
Rāma, 8, 9
Rāmakrishna, 161
Rāmāyaṇa, 9, 10
Rasā, 8
Ratush-Ratush, 172
Raychaudhuri, Hemachandra, 4-6, 9, 13-4,
Religion, definition of, 88
Renou, 57
Ṛgveda, 9, 31, 33-35, 37, 39, 41, 42, 44-7, 50, 51, 54-6, 58, 63-5, 67, 69, 71, 73, 85-8, 92, 100, 103, 107-11, 124, 127, 152, 154, 156, 169, 174, 183
Ṛgvedic India, 93, 99
—period, 90
Rhys David, 160
Ṛk-prātiśākhya, 37, 38, 65
Ṛk Saṁhitā, 9, 14-30, 90
Ṛk Saṅgraha, 95
Romans, 88
Roth, 31, 90, 95
Rudra, 10, 47, 88, 91, 112, 121
(=god of fire), 92
(=Iśāna or the Mahādeva), 92
(=Paśupati), 92
Rudrādhyāya, 110
Rupar, 77

S

Sachau, 137
Sādhya, 10
Śaiśirīya Śikṣā, 27
Śākadvīpa Brāhmaṇas, 185
Śākalya, 18, 37, 38, 65, 69, 86
Śākalya's padapāṭha, 38
Śākala recension, 38
Śākapūṇi, 96
Śakas, 45, 104, 122
Sakā Haumavaryā, 22
Sāma-padapāṭha, 26
Sāmans, 24
Śambara, 10, 31
Sāmaveda, 16, 20, 24, 26, 30, 87
Saṁhitāpāṭha, 38, 65
Śams, 90

Sandaṁśanyāya, 32
Śaṅkara, 121
Śaṅkha, 89
Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta-sūtra, 58
Sāp (=Skt. 'sarpa'), 112
Sapta-Sindhu, 100
Sarsuti, 97
Sarasvān, 97
Sārasvata Sattra, 14
Sarasvatyaḥ, 96
Sarasvatī, 14, 74, 77, 93, 95
—basin, 14
Sarayū, 5, 8-10
Sargon, 113, 145, 174
Śarīra, 60
Śanus, 91
Śarva, 102, 121
(=Rudra), 118
Sassanian(s), 135
—rule, 135
Śāstras, 87
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 6, 13, 26, 30, 35, 40, 50, 121
Sattra Namī Sāpya, 14
Saturer, 98
Satvants, 10, 11
Sātvata, 162
Satyavrata Sāmāśramin, 26
Śaunaka, 37-8, 65
Saurva, 117
Sauru, 117-8, 120-21
Saurum, 117
Sāvitrī ṛc, 30
Sāyaṇa, 25, 26, 95, 97-8
Schmidt, Pater, 88
Schrader, Otto, 88
Sen, Priyaranjan, 132
Seno, 129, 136
Sewell, 43, 44
Shamasastry, Dr. R., 28
Shubbiluliuma, 39
Shuriaaś, 147
Siebezieg Lieder, 54
Sindhu, 8
Sindhunada, 98
Śiśnadevas, 45
Sitaram, K.N., 115
Śiva, 47, 48, 91, 112, 118, 121
(=āśutoṣa), 92
Skanda, 35, 36
—svāmin, 35, 37
Smārta, 42
Smith, Philip, 143
Smṛti, 18, 68
Sogdianus, 144
Soma, 21, 22, 142
Spenddāt, 128, 133, 144
Spento Manyu, 113, 163
Sphya (=wooden sword), 122
Śraddhā, 110
Śrautins, 62, 66, 68
Śrīmad Bhāgavata, 11
Śrauta-sūtras, 42
Śrauta-sūtra Bhāradvāja's), 27
Śrauta-sūtra (Kātyāyana's), 27
Śruti, 67, 68
Stambayajurharaṇa, 122
Stein Sir, A., 98
Subbilulima, 180
Subrahmaṇya, 23
Sudās, 11, 21, 72, 74, 77
Śūdras, 45
Śukla Yajurveda Saṁhitā, 102
Sukṣatra, 182
Sūktavāka, 23
Śulbasūtra of Kātyāyana, 28
Sun, 32, 90
Śunaḥśepa, 58
Suriash, 176
Sūryā, 49
Śuṣṇa, 10, 31-2
Sutlej, 11, 12, 72, 74, 84, 97
Śutudrī, 21
Śutudrī (=Sutlej), 73
Śutudrī (the modern Sutlej), 97
Svarbhānu, 111

T

Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, 18, 67
Taittirīya Saṁhitā, 49, 50
Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa, 14, 26, 49, 111
Tapas, 51, 61
Taraporewala, 93
Taruṇa, 90
Tartars, 122
Tasha, 172
Taura, 117, 119
Tavas, 152
Taylor, A.E., 143
Tedesco, Paul, 160
Theodore barkhoni, 130, 131, 137, 161, 167-8
Thieme, Paul, 37, 170
Tilak, B.G., 40, 48
Toi, 172
Triśūla, 48
Trita Āptya, 88
Trojan War, 178
Tṛtsu Bharatas, 12
Turkoman, 128
Tyramong, 81

U

Udgītha, 31
Upabhṛt, 23
Urarisch, 20
U-ru-va-na, 39, 40
U-ru-va-na-āsh-shil-el, 38-9
Urvaśī, 8
Ustāvaiti, 113
Utkara, 121
Uvvaṭa, 35

V

Vādāyoit, 173
Vahran, 88
Vaidikapadānukramakośa, 25
Vainomoinen, 30
Vaitāna Sūtra, 57
Vājasaney Saṁhitā, 35, 96
Vājins, 98
Vajra, 122
Vara, 93, 94
Váraá pṛthivyāḥ, 74
Varathragna, 88
Varcin, 10
Varənya, 117, 119
Varənya (=Gīlān), 118
Varma, Siddheshwar, 37
Varuṇa, 39, 46, 57, 58, 61, 89-91, 180-81
Varuṇa (=night sun), 90
Varuṇa (=presiding deity), 90
Vaśa-Uśīnaras, 10, 11
Vaṣat, 23
Vasiṣṭha, 72
Vāstrā, 172
Vāsudeva, 145
Vasumitra, 136
Vāyu, 110
Vedāṅgajyotiṣa, 28
Vedapāṭha, 62
Vedic Aryans, 43, 51
Vedic Chronology, 85
Vedic Culture, 41
Vedic Indians, 103
Vedic Mythology, 95, 97
Vedic Rudra, 48
Vedic Sanskrit, 174
Vedic Studies, 54
Vedisch Studien, 54
Vendidād, 94, 116, 163
Veṅkaṭamādhava, 26
Veṅkatasubbiah, 35, 54
Venkaṭeswara, 41, 48
Verethraghna, 57
Vidarbha, 5-7
Vidarbha Country, 6
Vidarbhin, 6
Vidarbhin kauṇḍinya, 6
Videgha (=Videha), 13, 14
Vikrama Era, 128
Vikramāditya, 30, 35, 36
Vinaśana, 14
Vipāś, 21, 97
Vipāś (=Beas), 73

Viṣṇu, 89, 91, 121
Vishtāspa, 130, 131, 134, 139, 159, 161, 169, 182, 183
Viśvabandhu Śāstrī, 25
Viśvadeva, 17, 177
Viśvāmitra, 11, 12, 21, 71-4, 84
Vohu-kshathra Gāthā, 113
Vohūman, 128, 129, 133
Vohūman Spenddāt, 134
Vohūnām, 136
Vṛṣākapi, 49
Vṛtra, 32, 57
Vṛtrahan, 57
Vṛtrahan (Indra), 88
Vṛtrahan-Verethraghna, 57
Vyāhṛtis, 10

W

West, E.W., 127, 129, 130, 132-36, 161, 167
Winternitz, M., 3, 4, 6, 14, 84, 174
Worterbuch zum Ṛgveda, 97, 98

X

Xanthus, 141-4, 178
Xerxes, 14, 142, 178, 184
Xshyanto, 172

Y

Yādavas, 11
Yahve, 162
Yajamāna, 8, 41
Yajurveda Saṁhitā, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 56, 87, 110
Yajurvedic texts, 46
Yājyā, 23, 87
Yama, King, 8
Yāska, 12, 37, 38, 75, 76, 96, 99
Yasna 102
Yasna Hapta hyaiti, 160
Yaśodharman, 36
Yavanas, 45
Yazata, 111, 114-5
Yazata Vərethragna, 119
Yazdigird III, 135
Yima, 93, 94
Younger Avesta, 107, 160, 175, 176
Yuan Chwang, 36, 136
Yūpa, 23
Yoga, 51, 61-2, 85

Z

Zardusht, 130
Zarathushtra, 85, 86, 94, 103-106, 113-4, 121, 124-5, 127, 130, 134-6, 138, 141-2, 144-6, 149, 152-3, 156, 159-65, 170, 174, 176, 179, 181-85
Zarathushtra (=the protector of cattle), 164
Zarathustrianism, 108
Zarathustrians, 112
Zarathustrian doctrine, 116
Zaratūṣt, 128-9, 133
Zāt-sparam, 127
—Selections from, 128-30, 135, 136, 167
Zeus, 89
—Pater, 88
Zimmer, 95
Zoroaster, 132
Zoroastrian Studies, 130, 132
—Theology, 119
Zranka, 182